

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SANDY HOOK PUBLIC HEARING

B E F O R E :

KAY JENSEN - Moderator, League of Woman Voters
MICHAEL ADLERSTEIN - Associate Regional Director
DR. MARY FOLEY - Chief, Natural Resource Management
BETSY BARRETT - The Sandy Hook Foundation
WILLIAM H. ALEXANDER - Managing Director
FRANK CORRADO - Federal Highway Admin.
DAN SAUNDERS - Historic Preservation Office

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. JENSEN: Good afternoon. I am Kay Jensen, the moderator from the League of Woman Voters.

The purpose of this public meeting is to provide additional interrelations and we will respond to questions regarding the proposed plan for adaptive rehabilitation and adaptive use of 37 buildings at Fort Hancock.

Here is this afternoon's format. First, Park Superintendent Russ Wilson will be (inaudible). Following that, the seven candidates here to answer questions will introduce themselves and share their qualifications (inaudible). From then until four o'clock, if necessary, individuals will be given an opportunity to make comments and/or ask questions for three minutes each. The place to sign up is in the lobby. I will call speakers to the podium in the order in which they signed up, calling two at a time. Please be ready.

Beside me is a timekeeper. She will hold up a one-minute warning card when you have one minute left of your time. At the end of three minutes I will ask you to stop. Please, finish your sentence.

1

2 Today's proceedings will be recorded and
3 transcripts will be available from the park service
4 as part of the process. Let's begin with

5 Superintendent Wilson's presentation.

6 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, ma'am.

7 I'd like to enter a protest -- I'm sorry,
8 Superintendent. I must again protest the
9 three-minute limitation on the comments of
10 individuals. You are dealing with a multi-million
11 dollar project up here and everybody's being told
12 they only have three minutes. The last time we told
13 the public they had three minutes (inaudible) on
14 which to speak. If this is supposed to be a public
15 hearing I should not have to resign to --

16 MS. JENSEN: Excuse me. These --

17 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: I object.

18 MS. JENSEN: These -- your objection

19 is --

20 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: I object.

21 MS. JENSEN: -- taken under advisement.

22 The rules were published in the newspaper.

23 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: They were not my
24 rules.

25 MS. JENSEN: Well...

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: If they were my
rules I would have published them in the newspaper.
I would like to have a public hearing that we're --

MS. JENSEN: I am very sorry --

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- (inaudible)
statement, I raised my hand --

MS. JENSEN: -- in consultation with the
park service I assisted in the drafting of the rules
and that is the way they will stand.

Superintendent Wilson, please.

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't know why you
bother having a public hearing if you're gonna have
that kind of set up.

MR. WILSON: On behalf of the National
Park Service I'd like to welcome you all. I much
appreciate you coming and appreciate your interest
in the restoration of Fort Hancock.

I have a short -- I'll try to keep it
real short. I have a power-point presentation and
it's a little bit of the history of what got us to
this point in time and let me see if I can get this
to work okay.

(Pause.)

MR. WILSON: The Gateway National

1

2 Recreation Area was created by congress in 1972, and
3 at that time it was a bold experiment in bringing
4 the national park system into urban areas. Fort
5 Hancock -- when the military departed Fort Hancock
6 in 1974, at the end of the Nike Missile Era, the
7 National Park Service assumed responsibility for the
8 administration of this area of Fort Hancock.

9

 By 1979, Gateway National Recreation Area
10 had created its general management plan and that
11 plan called for the restoration and adaptive reuse
12 of Fort Hancock and it was covered by an
13 environmental impact statement.

14

 In 1990, we had an opportunity to revisit
15 that plan as part of our 1990 general management
16 plan amendments and those amendments identified a
17 public/private partnership as the best way to raise
18 the monies that would be necessary to restore these
19 buildings.

20

 In 1977, we published the Fort Hancock
21 Rehabilitation Guidelines and those outlined under
22 the Secretary of the Interior standards for historic
23 preservation what sorts of treatment would need to
24 take place or could not take place in order to
25 restore the buildings here in Fort Hancock.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In 1999, the National Park Service issued a request for proposals. We published a list of what buildings could potentially be available and in the request for proposals we set out some uses that we deemed as being acceptable for the adaptive reuse and some uses which we deemed were not acceptable for adaptive reuse out here. For example, office space was acceptable, private residential use was not.

The request for proposals also set out several goals. There was a program goal which was to create a year-round community of educational research and recreational organizations. We recognize that in order to truly preserve these buildings once they were restored we'd need people to live in them year-round or -- not so much live in them, use them year-round to heat them, to make sure all the systems were up and running during the winters here. There was a historic preservation goal to ensure the preservation of Fort Hancock which is a national historic landmark, one of 2,300 in the country. A building maintenance and occupancy goal to ensure the buildings were occupied in a timely manner and maintained over the life of

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

the lease.

The RFP also established seven criteria that persons or organizations submitting proposals would have to address. They would have to tell us who their project team was and show us their summary -- a summary of their team and the team's qualifications, they would present to us a preliminary reuse concept that would abide by National Park Service goals, they had to demonstrate a commitment to environmental stewardship and sustainability, demonstration of experience in historic restoration and adaptive reuse, show us that they were financially capable, provide us with their insurance requirements and proposed business terms and conditions.

22 proposals were received by the National Park Service and there was an article in a local newspaper this past week which was perhaps a little bit confusing. We, at the request of Congressman Pallone, we made these documents available to the public and we put them on deposit at about ten area libraries and they do serve as sort of a historical background to why we're here today, but we're here today to talk about two

1

2 proposals, the American Literal Society and a
3 proposal to -- which is to lease their Officers Row
4 building to them and to -- a second proposal by
5 Sandy Hook Partners to renovate and sublease 36
6 other buildings in the Fort Hancock area.

7

8 The selection committee that sat to
9 review the requests that we got in 1999 included
10 senior National Park Service managers who were
11 selected because of a particular area of expertise,
12 historian landscape architect, park superintendent,
13 but it was an independent panel, it was not
14 comprised of anybody from Sandy Hook. Michael
15 Adlerstein, the Associate Regional Director from
16 National Park Service who's on stage today was the
17 chair of that committee. The committee also had
18 advisors. Lawrence Hanslen (phonetic) who is a
19 retired Department of the Interior solicitor served
20 as a consultant as did William Alexander who is a
21 professor at the Wharton Business School of the
22 University of Pennsylvania and Mr. Alexander joins
23 us on stage today.

24

25 Sandy Hook Partners who we -- who was
chosen to restore and manage and sublease most of
the buildings was selected based on four main

1
2 criteria. They would deal comprehensively with all
3 the buildings, even the really troublesome buildings
4 like the Officers Club that's in really poor
5 repair. We recognized pretty early on that if
6 people wanted to come in and cherry pick to pick a
7 couple buildings that weren't too bad, that was
8 easy, but to tackle all of the buildings within the
9 national historic landmark comprehensively was a
10 real advantage.

11 Sandy Hook Partners proposed no new
12 construction. If anyone took the time to review the
13 background documents that we released, some of those
14 proposals would only come in if they were allowed to
15 build substantial new -- put substantial new
16 buildings within Sandy Hook and that was not
17 something we wanted to see. Their proposal of mixed
18 uses was compatible with the current Park Partners.
19 They proposed to expand on the educational and
20 research base that's here at Sandy Hook, to provide
21 office space and to provide some hospitality in the
22 form of various food service and some bed and
23 breakfast overnight accommodations.

24 Just some other highlights of the plan.
25 Fort Hancock is 100 -- approximately 140 acres of

1

2 the some 1,600 acres that comprise the park. The
3 natural and cultural environment will be enhanced
4 through the revenues generated from this project,
5 the revenues that will come back to the National
6 Park Service. As we implement the plan K Lot, which
7 is our overflow parking lot, the northern most lot
8 in Sandy Hook will be completely revegetated and
9 it's an area that's adjacent to critical bird
10 habitat and we'll remove those parking spaces into
11 satellite lots around Fort Hancock and we've chosen
12 areas that are all -- to put those lots that are
13 already heavy impacted from past army use.

14 Traditional recreational uses in the fort
15 will not be affected. This lease doesn't involve
16 any lands, it only involves buildings on their
17 footprint. The environmental assessment that we
18 released for public review and which brings us all
19 here today actually covers all of the structures
20 within Fort Hancock and some 97 structures, not just
21 the 38 buildings that are proposed as part of this
22 lease.

23 There's some 40 structures the National
24 Park Service will continue to use and maintain and
25 there's approximately 20 structures that are

1
2 currently out to other -- that are currently under
3 agreement with other groups here in Sandy Hook,
4 National Oceanographic and Atmospheric
5 Administration, New Jersey Marine and Science
6 Conservation, the Marine Academy of Science and
7 Technology, the Sandy Hook Foundation at the Light
8 Keepers Quarters and our newest partner is that New
9 Jersey Audubon in the southern most house on
10 Officers Row. So, those -- all of those buildings
11 will be continued to be used by the current Park
12 Partners.

13 Fort Hancock's area is depicted in sort
14 of the purple spot to the left of the screen. Most
15 of Sandy Hook is managed as a natural area and just
16 to recap again, I know it's kind of hard to see the
17 various colors, but the green buildings are
18 buildings that currently are used and managed by the
19 National Park Service and will continue to be used
20 and managed by the National Park Service, the purple
21 buildings are those buildings used by our existing
22 Park Partners and 29 buildings that are currently
23 under agreement and this lease involves the southern
24 most building, again, the Literal Society, but then
25 the light blue buildings would be leased to the

1

2 Sandy Hook Partners.

3

4 Again, the uses that the buildings would
5 be put to are educational and research use, office
6 space, meeting space and hospitality space in the
7 form of some bed and breakfast overnight rooms in
8 the old Officers Club and some bed and breakfast
9 rooms along off the southern part of Officers Row
10 and food service at the Officers Club, the meal barn
11 and cafeteria service weekdays at one of the
12 Enlisted Men's barracks. So, with that, I'll turn
13 it back over to Ms. Jensen. Thank you.

14

MS. JENSEN: Thank you.

15

16 Now I'd like to have the seven panelists
17 introduce themselves and give their areas of
18 expertise starting from your left.

19

20 MR. ALEXANDER: My name is Bill Alexander
21 and I am on the faculty of the Wharton School,
22 University of Pennsylvania.

23

24 My selection to serve as a consultant on
25 this project is based not on that appointment, but
26 on the fact that for 25 years prior to joining the
27 University of Pennsylvania I was a contractor and
28 developer in central and eastern Pennsylvania
29 performing significant amounts of historic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

preservation development.

MS. BARRETT: I'm Betsy Barrett. I'm a trustee of the Sandy Hook Foundation. The foundation has been out here for about ten years as a volunteer entity to help the National Park Service in restoration and rehabilitation, fund-raising, grant ready, that kind of thing. We're a very small entity, one that's growing, but certainly not one able to take on this enormous project on our own. We're simply here to compliment and to try to put together grant-ready and people to facilitate the around the buildings.

Currently we're undergoing restoration rehabilitation at the Lighthouse Keeper's Quarters. I'm sure a number of you heard a great deal about that. We're a few years away from accomplishing the whole project, but we have now some experience about how difficult it is to rehabilitate and restore one property in particular out here and we're also sitting in the theater which the Foundation helped to also rehabilitate along with the National Park Service. So, we also help bring in cultural and educational resources.

MS. FOLEY: I'm Mary Foley. I'm the

1

2 regional chief scientist for the National Park
3 Service in Boston. It's the role of my office to
4 support parks and resource, natural resource
5 preservation activities from research and resource
6 management.

7

MR. SAUNDERS: I'm Dan Saunders. I'm
8 with the State of New Jersey. I work in the State
9 Historic Preservation office which is part of the
10 Division of Parks and Forestry which in turn is part
11 of the Department of Environmental Protection. I'm
12 not affiliated with the National Park Service in any
13 way or the federal government, for that matter.

14 My role -- the reason I'm here is that I
15 have -- as a project reviewer in the historic
16 preservation office I've been involved in Sandy Hook
17 for about 15 years and I certainly watched this
18 project develop over the last five, although I have
19 to say usually I'm here in the wintertime when it's
20 nice and cold, but I have to point out that there
21 aren't a whole lot more people in Fort Hancock today
22 than there are on a day in January. It's the most
23 developed area in terms of buildings of Sandy Hook
24 and it is the least used I would suggest. I'm
25 really involved in three ways in terms of reviewing

1

2 the project through various state and federal laws.

3

4 The environmental assessment is being
5 reviewed -- has been reviewed by the Department of
6 Environmental Protection. We contributed in
7 providing comments on the cultural resource
8 considerations as part of that analysis. There's an
9 ongoing Section 106 review. Section 106 is the
10 National Historic Preservation Law that requires
11 federal agencies to consider the affect of their
12 actions on historic properties. We are -- the state
13 is -- most of the responsibility for 106 review is
14 delegated to the states and I work in the office
15 that details that role, so it's our job to ensure
16 that federal projects don't have adverse effects as
17 here at the Hook.

18 There's also an independent agency called
19 the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that's
20 invoked when there will be an adverse effect on our
21 national historic landmarks such as we have here, so
22 that's an independent federal agency that's separate
23 from the National Park Service as well.

24 As I say, I've been involved in this
25 project for five years, I've watched the project
develop and I want to note that there are some

1
2 unusual documents here that I'm sure are unusual if
3 you don't have some perspective on how leasing is
4 done. The extent to which guidelines for
5 rehabilitation, the treatment of the landscape, for
6 signage, for painting being developed is very
7 unusual and I think very important. It's a way of
8 controlling what happens out here and what's at
9 stake is the future of Sandy Hook and one thing we
10 can be sure of is that if we do nothing things will
11 continue to change. They're deteriorating now,
12 there's sort of a long, slow curve in deterioration
13 of the buildings and at a certain point it starts to
14 drop very fast. We're not at that fast drop yet,
15 but we're gonna get there some day, so no change is
16 not an option. The course that we have to do is to
17 advise the park service on what change would be
18 appropriate and best, what we try to do through the
19 Section 106 process.

20 MR. CORRADO: Good afternoon. My name is
21 Frank Corrado. I'm with the Federal Lance Highway
22 Unit of the Federal Highway Administration. I am
23 their traffic operations engineer and my work is
24 national in scope. Prior to working with Federal
25 Highway Administration I've worked as a traffic and

1

2 transportation engineer for about 15 years in the
3 New York City Metropolitan area. I am a licensed
4 professional engineer and I'm also certified
5 nationally as a professional traffic operations
6 engineer.

7

For this project I was called more for
8 technical services to assist the park in the traffic
9 issues associated with this project, conduct a
10 traffic operations assessment focusing more on the
11 outcome, potential outcome of what this development
12 may have on the street system outside of the park
13 closely coordinating with the Federal Highway
14 Division office in Trenton, New Jersey, as well as
15 the State DOT.

16

MR. WILSON: I'm Russ Wilson. I'm the
17 superintendent of the Sandy Hook Unit of Gateway
18 National Recreation Area. I've worked for the
19 National Park Service for 25 years. I've been
20 here -- well, I'm working on my third year here. I
21 arrived at Sandy Hook right at the point where
22 Michael's committee was ending their process of
23 selecting or making recommendations to the regional
24 director about who to select to negotiate with for
25 the leases that would help us restore an adaptive

1

2 reuse for Fort Hancock and I came in as part of the
3 committee that negotiated with the Sandy Hook
4 Partners and the American Literal Society over their
5 leases.

6

MR. ADLERSTEIN: I'm Mike Adlerstein,
7 associate regional director for the northeast region
8 of the National Park Service. I manage many of the
9 partnership projects throughout the northeast region
10 which is about 80 parks spread out from Maine to
11 Virginia and I manage the design and construction
12 program for the restoration and rehabilitation of
13 our facilities.

14

I've been involved with the Sandy Hook
15 planning since the mid-'70s when I was involved with
16 the overall Gateway general management plan and I've
17 been involved in various ways with the various
18 public documents that have been prepared by the park
19 service over the past 25 years for Sandy Hook and
20 for the rest of Gateway including, as was noted up
21 here, including my involvement as team leader for
22 the selection panel for this present leasing
23 opportunity.

24

MS. JENSEN: Thank you. Now, it's your
25 turn. A few comments to those of you who will be

1
2 speaking. I will try my best to pronounce your
3 names correctly. When you come up to the
4 microphone, if you wish you may identify the town
5 that you live in and I will be calling a person to
6 speak and one to be standing by and then I will call
7 that one up and one to be standing by so that we can
8 move this along as quickly as possible and for those
9 of you who speak, we will show you what the warning
10 card looks like when you have one minute left.

11 We'll begin with the first person on the
12 list and -- sir.

13 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: You have a rule
14 about questions? Are questions a minute between
15 speakers?

16 MS. JENSEN: Anybody who speaks may
17 either comment and/or ask questions when -- as part
18 of it.

19 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, do you have to
20 have signed up to ask the questions?

21 MS. JENSEN: Yes, and you do that in the
22 lobby. First on the list is Ann Rombey followed by
23 Tom Maika.

24 MS. ROMBEY: Good afternoon. I'm Ann
25 Rombey, President of Monmouth County Friends of

1

2 Clearwater and I'm a resident of Highlands and it is
3 with great concern that I address you today on
4 behalf of Monmouth County Friends of Clearwater.

5

6 We have reviewed your materials and
7 listened to the previous hearing and our
8 organization has also been part of the Sandy Hook
9 community for the last 25 years. Today we have
10 several points to make. One, we support the
11 objective of saving these structures. Fort Hancock
12 is one of the most beautiful communities in our
13 nation. These buildings should continue to serve us
14 all; however if saving them means excessive
15 commercialization and loss of public access we would
16 rather let them go.

16

17 We recognize that obtaining
18 rehabilitation funding from our government is not
19 going to happen. This is not to say we agree with
20 these priorities, had this park been properly funded
21 and managed for the past 25 years we would not be
22 facing this crisis. All this notwithstanding we
23 agree that action should be taken soon to save these
24 buildings. On the face of it, this proposal seems
25 reasonable in our view. The weakest link here is
the issue of financial viability. By any measure,

1

2 this concept calls for huge investment. We have not
3 seen evidence or heard convincing testimony that
4 this plan will generate the necessary income,
5 indeed, we've heard some testimony that it will
6 not. If income false short, we can easily foresee
7 incremental compromises that could lead to a
8 dreadful commercialization of our park.

9

 One argument the park has made for the
10 plan is that it will generate a great deal of
11 revenue for Sandy Hook, additional income that can
12 be used to maintain the park. This is clearly, at
13 best, a naive notion. The park service has and will
14 continue to direct its income at what it considers
15 its highest priorities whether that be Sandy Hook or
16 the Grand Canyon. Our gravest concern remains the
17 park service's poor record of public process. We
18 are pleased that the parks have responded to the
19 concerns of the many over the issues and are -- over
20 this issue and are holding this additional hearing,
21 but this is just the latest in a long line of
22 haphazard efforts to be inclusive.

23

 A permanent solution needs to be found.
24 We propose that the park service create a standing
25 committee to review these kinds of matters and make

1
2 recommendations on public process. This group could
3 review any use change proposals of Sandy Hook
4 Partners as well as others. The body should include
5 representatives from Sandy Hook and the surrounding
6 communities. Of course, to be credible the group
7 needs to include many different viewpoints and thank
8 you for your time and consideration and if we can be
9 of any assistance, please feel free to call on us.
10 Thank you.

11 MS. JENSEN: Tom Maika will be followed
12 by Eileen Woodward.

13 MR. MAIKA: Thank you. My comments will
14 be a little bit different. I just got back from a
15 five-day retreat at Genesis Farm in northwest Jersey
16 which is a place of reinventing how we inhabit this
17 earth and it's a story that they talk there about
18 the universe. The universe is 15 billion years
19 old.

20 I wanted to shift the thought process
21 from historical preservation to -- of a few 100
22 years ago to our main mission, all of us. I honor
23 all of you up here, I honor all of you here. Our
24 mission is to protect the earth. Our mission is to
25 protect the life-support systems that this earth has

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

granted us.

We have a wonderful model here on Sandy Hook. This is a holy place, a sacred place. I have removed my shoes because it's a very holy place and what's happening here is a great birth. All these people here are giving birth to a vision and all of you can help with that vision. You all have great capacities and the time is now.

We all know that the earth is in crisis. We all know that we are all connected, each one of us, every human being, every living being on this earth. The seas we were the seas, the earth we were the earth.

The model that we have been given is already here, the model of sustainability. It has been brought forth by many people here at Sandy Hook. First, I honor all of the rangers. I honor all your work, the beekeepers of the light, keepers here of Sandy Hook the beacon of light. I honor old salty dogs like Barry Bennett, I honor old salty dogs like Jack Charlton who have the vision and who have brought it to us. I honor the women who have birthed this vision, Clean Ocean Action, Cindy, Marybeth, Kristin, all the scientists here who are

1

2 the mystics of our time. The scientists see the
3 essence of life, they see we are all created. This
4 is our mission, anything else is not important.
5 This is our mission.

6

I was just at a birthday party and I was
7 thinking of the great celebration there and we just
8 look around at the great celebration here and all of
9 its life forms. I ask you to be inspired by that as
10 well. I also have a story that we read to our
11 children --

12

MS. JENSEN: I'm sorry, time is up.

13

MR. MAIKA: I just ask you for one
14 minute. It was 15 billion years to invent this
15 cosmos, I ask for one or two more minutes to speak
16 for those who cannot be here, the dolphins, the
17 birds, the trees. I ask for you to consider the
18 story of King Midas that we read to our story
19 (sic). Yes, the people here who are very talented
20 who have brought forth a creative vision, I honor
21 them and their creative vision, but the vision that
22 we're called to is one to protect and honor the
23 earth.

24

MS. JENSEN: Thank you.

25

MR. MAIKA: The King Midas story is one

1

2 where everything they touched turned to gold, but
3 what happened when they turned -- the king touched
4 his own daughter. His own daughter turned to gold,
5 so I ask you to stretch --

6 MS. JENSEN: We need to move onto the
7 next person.

8 MR. MAIKA: I understand. I understand.

9 MS. JENSEN: Thank you. Eileen Woodward,
10 please.

11 MR. MAIKA: I will end, I will end
12 with --

13 MS. JENSEN: I think you've ended.

14 MR. MAIKA: I will end with I hope the
15 elder speaks. You have been telling the people that
16 this is the 11th hour, now you must go back and tell
17 the people that this is the hour and there are
18 things to be considered. Where are you living?
19 What are you doing? What are your relationships?
20 Are you in right relation? Where is your water?
21 Know your garden. It is time to speak your truth,
22 create your community, be good to each other and do
23 not look outside yourselves for the leader.

24 MS. JENSEN: The one who is waiting on
25 deck now is Mary Lou Strong.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MAIKA: All right. 30 seconds. 30 seconds. Then he pressed his hands together, smiled and said, This could be a good time. There is a river flowing very fast, it is so great and swift that there are those who will be afraid. They will try to hold onto the shore, they will feel they are being torn apart and will suffer greatly. Know the river has its destination. The elders say we must let go of the shore, push off into the middle of the river, keep our eyes open and our heads above water.

MS. JENSEN: Could we please have this gentleman escorted to the rear?

MR. MAIKA: And I say see who is there with you and celebrate at this time in history. 15 seconds. You are the ones who we've been calling for, I honor you.

MS. STRONG: Good afternoon. My name is Mary Lou Strong, I'm chairman of the Middletown Land Marsh Commission and I don't know how many people know that Sandy Hook and Fort Hancock are a part of Middletown and Middletown is one of Monmouth County's three original townships.

Well, today I have a letter that I would

1

2 like to read sent to the Land Marsh Commission.
3 It's from Michael W. Huber who I think is pretty
4 well-known in our area as being the gentleman who is
5 responsible for his family's magnificent gift of the
6 Huber Woods to the Monmouth County Park System. I
7 hope the panel will address the questions that Mike
8 raises in this letter which I'm going to read.

9

It says, The Land Marsh Commission:

10 "Dear Madame, Since I am unable to attend the
11 National Park Service hearing on Saturday, June 1st,
12 I am writing you my comments which you may present
13 at the hearing if you so choose.

14

"I am in favor of preserving the
15 historic buildings in the Fort Hancock section of
16 Sandy Hook, in particular the houses on Officers
17 Row, the Officers Club, the theater and the other
18 buildings surrounding the parade ground. I think it
19 is shameful that the government of the richest
20 country in the history of the world chooses not to
21 fund the National Park Service adequately so that it
22 is unable to spend the money necessary to preserve
23 the historic structures that are part of our
24 national parks.

25

"Since this seems to be a fact I am in

1
2 favor of the concept behind the proposed lease to
3 Sandy Hook Partners. My concerns about the proposal
4 center around the future. Are there safeguards in
5 the lease so that should the financial projections
6 of Sandy Hook Partners not be borne out they will
7 not be allowed to construct new facilities that turn
8 Sandy Hook into a theme park or a resort hotel
9 complex? Will they be held to the presently
10 proposed building restoration and not allowed to
11 expand to offer activities beyond the present scope
12 outlined in the environmental assessment? If not,
13 the park service should not be allowed to proceed
14 without amendment to the proposed lease.

15 "I am glad the park service has opened
16 some of the documents to the public and that in
17 response to public pressure it is holding this
18 hearing. I hope they will explain the process they
19 went through to select SHP's proposal, the criteria
20 used in the selection process and the reasoning used
21 to reject other proposal. The public needs to be
22 reassured that whatever's done at Sandy Hook to
23 preserve the historic structures does not destroy
24 environmental values and infringe on the public's
25 present enjoyment of the Sandy Hook Unit of the

1

2 Gateway National Park.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"Sincerely, Michael W. Huber, board member American Literal Society, Monmouth Conservation Foundation, The Nature Conservancy New Jersey Chapter and Pine Lands Preservation Alliance."

And thank you very much and I hope that whether you're a preservationist or conservationist we can all get together and row the boat for the future of this wonderful part of Middletown Township. Thank you.

MS. JENSEN: May I have your name again?

MS. STRONG: Mary Lou Strong.

MS. JENSEN: Next up will be Gary Cooper after this speaker.

MS. WOODWARD: My name is Eileen Woodward. I'm the northeast regional director of the National Parks Conservation Association. We are a private nonprofit citizens organization that advocates for the protection of national parks and we have 400,000 members across the country.

NPCA supports the concept of the proposal, but we do have a few concerns that are remedied -- that can be remedied. NPS faces an

1
2 enormous challenge to protect the over 30,000
3 historic structures in the national park system. To
4 leave them as they are would be demolition by
5 neglect. The National Park Service needs to use all
6 of its available tools to carry out its
7 congressionally legislated mandate to preserve these
8 historic structures. It's incredibly difficult to
9 do that when you don't have the funds and congress
10 doesn't give you the funds to do that.

11 Historic leasing -- the Historic Leasing
12 Authority is a legitimate tool of the National Park
13 Service to use in preservation of historic
14 structures and this is the tool that's being used in
15 this proposal. If this proposal is carried out
16 well, it will preserve not only the historic
17 structures, but it will infuse Fort Hancock with a

18 new vitality and a new life. We do have some
19 specific concerns, but most of those, as I said, can
20 be easily remedied, they focus around the cultural
21 landscape and its integration into the restoration
22 plan.

23 NPCA adamantly opposes commercialization
24 of our national parks, but we understand and support
25 specific commercial uses when those commercial uses

1

2 support the mission and purpose of the park. This
3 proposal must go to great lengths to ensure that
4 future uses will support the Sandy Hook mission.
5 NPCA looks forward to working with the National Park
6 Service to enable a constructive conclusion to this
7 process. Thank you.

8

MS. JENSEN: Mr. Adlerstein wishes to
9 respond to a question raised by the previous speaker
10 concerning if the economics of the project fail.

11

MR. ADLERSTEIN: I just wanted to address

12

-- is that on?

13

I just wanted to address the issue that
14 was raised twice now from the Friends of Clearwater
15 and from the previous speaker about if the economics
16 fail, what safeguards does the community have that
17 the developer or the subsequent developer would not
18 be allowed to do activities that are not presently
19 being discussed and the safeguards are very
20 powerful.

21

First of all, the National Park Service
22 is not going to allow activities that are not
23 recognized and identified in the present
24 environmental assessment. The lease prohibits it,
25 but more importantly the environmental assessment

1

2 and the public review process prohibits us from
3 allowing those -- from allowing activities to happen
4 at Sandy Hook that we are not discussing with the
5 public.

6

There's an enormous body of law that
7 requires the National Park Service to discuss with
8 the public facilities, activities, programs that are
9 going on in the national park system. The General
10 Management Plan from 1979, and subsequent amendments
11 and the most recent EA that's presently under
12 discussion and other documents in between, all
13 identify the directions that we want to go. We
14 discuss them with the public, we have this kind of
15 forum and then we come to a conclusion as to whether
16 we're justified in proceeding.

17

So, our commitment is to the public and
18 the variety of groups, from the local groups at
19 Sandy Hook, from community groups here in the
20 community, from NPCA and the variety of national
21 groups that provide oversight over us are all means
22 by which you can be assured that we're not going to
23 allow activities that have not been discussed with
24 you.

25

MS. JENSEN: Gary Cooper will be followed

1

2 by Terry Zealand.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COOPER: Hello. My name is Gary

Cooper and I'm a Highlands resident. I am also a local artist. I've been coming down to Sandy Hook for over the last 12 years. I have slowly watched these buildings deteriorate and the plan by Sandy Hook Partners to save these buildings is a great

one. It's going to do what needed to be done by the National Park Service, but because of funding could not be done.

Now, my concern was, of course, like everybody else here, what happens if they don't make the projected revenue that they're supposed to make with all of the leasing and so on and so forth?

Well, it seems as our gentleman just discussed, that basically they have to go scratch if I get it correctly. That if they don't make the projected incomes, they're going to just have to sign-off on the leases or what happens here at that point?

MR. ADLERSTEIN: This will be an issue between the developer and his financial sources. We are not funding the project, the U.S. Government is not putting any money into the project, we are allowing this team, along with their financial

1

2 sources to develop the project under the terms that
3 we are permitting.

4

MR. COOPER: Oh, wonderful. It sounds
5 great. Thank you very much.

6

MS. JENSEN: Next up after Terry Zealand
7 is Peter Ochs.

8

MR. ZEALAND: My name is Dr. Terry
9 Zealand. I'm the executive director of the Aids
10 Resource Foundation for Children. My wife and I
11 opened a home for children with Aids 15 years ago
12 called St. Clare's Home and now we have three homes
13 that provide services for children in New Jersey and
14 we also do a lot of work with families with HIV. We
15 submitted a proposal. We were one of the 22 that
16 were submitted and we were not accepted which I
17 lament and -- but I'm taking a new course to keep us
18 out here at Sandy Hook.

19

The Aids Resource Foundation for Children
20 is a nonprofit community-based organization that has
21 provided a summer bed and breakfast for families
22 dealing with the reality of Aids at Building 5 on
23 Officers Row for six years. This wonderful site
24 provided the opportunity for hundreds of volunteers
25 from Monmouth County to fix breakfast, lunch and

1

2 dinner and to offer support for adults and children
3 who were dealing with the sad reality of Aids in
4 their lives. Church groups, synagogues and
5 compassionate people from all walks of life came
6 each summer to show how much they cared and left
7 with a feeling of having accomplished acts of
8 kindness for which God put them on earth.

9

With the redevelopment of Fort Hancock,
10 the presence of such a program at Sandy Hook is
11 threatened. The unique environment of Sandy Hook
12 made wonderful things happen to brighten the lives
13 of those less fortunate and, indeed, for children
14 and adults who are struggling to live one day at a
15 time. This program allowed a mother to spend
16 quality time with her son walking on the beach, it
17 allowed the father the chance to take his daughter
18 fishing, perhaps for their first and last time and
19 it gave children the chance to be children despite
20 the reality of Aids.

21

In light of the decision of the park
22 service to use the Wossel Group, I am asking both
23 Jim Wossel and the park service to consider inviting
24 St. Clare's to provide a year-round bed and
25 breakfast for families with Aids as one of the

1

2 nonprofit partners and make Building 5 a home as it
3 was for six memorable years and not use the building
4 as for-profit commercial office space. Thank you
5 very much.

6

MS. JENSEN: Peter Ochs is followed by
7 Patricia Ochs.

8

MR. OCHS: Good afternoon. My name is
9 Peter Ochs. My wife and I are residents of Fair
10 Haven recently moved back from the Washington, D.C.

11 area. I'm a retired federal procurement contracts
12 guy, I spent 29 years plus 23 years were with the
13 general services administration at headquarters in
14 Washington, D.C.

15 My opinions, questions and comments today
16 will be directed to the National Park Service
17 concerning the proposal for conducting the
18 rehabilitation of the National Park Service. The
19 subject matter which I am to address may appear to
20 be dry and unexciting, but it's my contribution to
21 try and keep Sandy Hook available to the public.

22 I spoke at the last meeting and I really
23 didn't have any basis other than just what I had
24 heard, but I had the opportunity to review the
25 proposals which were, after the last meeting, put

1

2 into the various libraries, but the proposals were
3 there, but what -- the RFP was not and I
4 subsequently called Superintendent Russel's office
5 and I'm still waiting for a return call, but I did
6 get a copy from Judge Coleman and when I reviewed
7 the RFP I had grave concern, particularly in the
8 evaluation criteria.

9

10 The code of federal regulations which all
11 federal procurements have to adhere to, particularly
12 the federal acquisition regulations, mandate that
13 the evaluation criteria and there were seven put up
14 on the board, state their relative order of
15 importance. The RFP did not contain that. Also, it
16 failed to address the relative importance of the
17 monetary aspects of the RFP. That wasn't in there
18 either and those things are essential because the
19 federal government asks that or mandates that that
20 be put in their federal procurements so as to temper
21 the possible subjectivity of the procuring offices
22 as well as providing to prospective offerers
23 information so that they know how to guide their
24 proposals so it's best received and neither was --
25 and that was not done and that's where I found the
proposal tremendously lacking.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other thing is I would like to know, was the RFP ever amended? The RFP that I was given for review was the one that was issued in, you know, August 1999. I don't know what day because you guys never put one on there and there isn't a number on it as there's supposed to be, it's just Sandy Hook Rehab.

MS. JENSEN: Would you like an answer to that now?

MR. OCHS: Sure. Is it gonna be taken from my time?

MR. ADLERSTEIN: In answer to the question was it amended, no, it was not amended.

MR. OCHS: It was not amended, okay. So, how about, did you receive any exemptions from the uniform contract format that's mandated for all government procurements? Which should be a part of the contract file.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: We can do these one by one or do you want to --

MR. OCHS: Well --

(End of Tape No. 1, Side A.)

MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- and under the leasing authority we have different regulations, different

1

2 rules. So, the rules that you're talking about are
3 under -- which we use for concessionaires and other
4 types of solicitations and acquisitions is not the
5 authority that was used for this RFP.

6 MR. OCHS: Well, then, why would it not
7 be beneficial that both parties know what the
8 evaluation criteria is so that offerers know how to
9 propose best and the subjectivity that might be
10 utilized by the selecting activity would be
11 minimized? You know, why would that not be
12 appropriate in whatever, you know, format you
13 utilize? And that was not in the RFP.

14 MR. ADLERSTEIN: The criteria --

15 MR. OCHS: Yes.

16 MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- was listed and it was
17 listed on the screen --

18 MR. OCHS: No, it was listed, but not in
19 the relative order of importance.

20 MR. ADLERSTEIN: No, we --

21 MR. OCHS: There were seven items, you
22 know --

23 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Right.

24 MR. OCHS: -- but they didn't say this is
25 No. 1, it's worth 50 out of a possible 100, it just

1

2 said here's seven items and this is what we're
3 gonna, you know, evaluate it against, but it was an
4 indefinite -- undefinitive yardstick.

5

MR. ADLERSTEIN: We listed the criteria
6 in conformance with the authority of the act of the
7 law that we were acting under which you are
8 obviously not familiar with, but if we don't --
9 under the authority which we have used in 30 or 40
10 different leasing opportunities this is the rules we
11 follow and the rules have been cleared by your
12 solicitors, so you are working from the wrong side
13 of information.

14

MR. OCHS: Okay. Well, then, you said
15 that the RFP was not amended; correct?

16

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Correct.

17

MR. OCHS: Okay. The RFP stated that
18 proposals were due November 6th, 1999. The Sandy
19 Hook proposal which you're seeking to make the award
20 to and that the letter of intent was issued to was
21 dated November 8th, 1999, two days later.

22

MS. JENSEN: I'm sorry --

23

MR. OCHS: How did you except the late
24 proposal?

25

MS. JENSEN: -- your time is up. Perhaps

1

2 it can be continued by...

3 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Answer the question.

4 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Answer the question.

5 MR. ADLERSTEIN: I don't think you have
6 correct information.7 MR. OCHS: Well, yes, it is, it's
8 November 6th is stated in the RFP.9 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Okay. Sir, we have an
10 answer, I believe.11 MR. LUSEIR: The answer to the question
12 is the November --

13 MR. OCHS: Who am I speaking to, please?

14 MR. LUSIER: David Lusier. I'm the
15 deputy superintendent of the Manhattan site. I was
16 business manager of Sandy Hook and I put together
17 the present proposal.

18 MR. OCHS: Could you have done better.

19 MR. LUSIER: The request for proposals is
20 not a procurement, is not a procurement, so you are
21 dealing with the wrong set --22 MR. OCHS: A request for proposals is not
23 a procurement?24 MR. LUSIER: The answer to your question
25 is the reason why November 8th was the acceptable

1

2 date for everybody was because November 6th was a
3 Saturday. So, people were allowed until Monday, the
4 first business day to do that and everybody knew it
5 and we got several proposals on November the 8th.

6 MR. OCHS: So, the RFP was never amended
7 even after you knew that the date that you had
8 specified three months prior was not a good date?
9 Doesn't sound like it's a good way to do business no
10 matter what procurement rules you're using.

11 Also, I have a question concerning how do
12 we get --

13 MS. JENSEN: If the speaker following you
14 wishes to have any time -- you're relinquishing the
15 whole three minutes?

16 MRS. OCHS: Yes.

17 MS. JENSEN: Okay.

18 MR. OCHS: Okay. The Sandy Hook Partners
19 proposal is the one that you issued the letter of
20 intent with; correct? I believe that's correct and
21 I did not see in the 22 proposals any offers
22 submitted by them. I did see an offer submitted by
23 the Wossel Realty Group. How did we get from Wossel
24 Realty, even though I understand that Mr. Wossel,
25 you know, is a senior in both legal entities, how

1

2 did we get to Sandy Hook Partners as being in the
3 catbird's seat?

4

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Our RFP also allows the
5 National Park Service or allows the developer to
6 assign the rights to a third party with the
7 concurrence of the National Park Service, so there's
8 no legal issue here and that --

9

MR. OCHS: I thought I saw prohibition
10 specifically against assignments in the RFP document
11 which was formulated by this gentleman?

12

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Our solicitor's office
13 has looked into this. Actually, we had a discussion
14 about this yesterday. We're in a --

15

MR. OCHS: Well, I wish you would have
16 had a procurement guy. I mean, I'm not -- you know,
17 this is the second time I've been here.

18

MR. ADLERSTEIN: This is not a
19 procurement.

20

MR. OCHS: It's not a procurement? Are
21 you going to make an award, sir? Are you gonna
22 obligate, you know, the government to perform
23 certain acts? I believe you are.

24

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Yes, we are.

25

MR. OCHS: So, I believe it is an award.

1

2 MR. ADLERSTEIN: I think what -- but the
3 authority that you're familiar with is clearly a
4 very different authority from the Historic Property
5 Leasing Authority which is the law under which we
6 are acting.

7 MR. OCHS: Well, in the event that I'm
8 gonna run over I would like to enter my comments on
9 the record and, you know, if we -- if somebody would
10 like to talk to me and tell me, you know, where I've
11 gone wrong on the other points that I've raised I'd
12 be more than glad to chat with you. Like I said, I
13 have trouble getting calls back from the
14 superintendent's office.

15 Okay. Thank you very much, but who do I
16 give my comments to?

17 MR. WILSON: I just wanted to say that
18 I'm starting to learn that the RFP's which we put on
19 deposit in the library had been dropped by many of
20 the libraries and you and one other person called
21 and we rushed copies back out to the libraries and
22 they're currently on deposit along with everything
23 else we put on deposit and I apologize for your
24 inconvenience.

25 MS. JENSEN: The next speaker will be

1

2 Charles Cassaro followed by Ed Segal.

3

4 MR. OCHS: Excuse me. Who do I give my
5 comments to to be made part of the permanent meeting
6 of record?

7

8 MS. JENSEN: I will see that they are
9 delivered.

10

11 MR. CASSARO: Hi. My name name is
12 Charlie Cassaro. I'm just a private citizen from
13 Middletown and I agree, but I don't have the legal
14 background some of these people do.15 My concern is basically environmental
16 with the addition of 665 parking spaces that I saw
17 in the assessment which are just designated by
18 circles, there's no delineation of areas or anything
19 like that and also in the assessment there was also
20 mention of considering the square footage of office
21 space being put in as the State DOT law or something
22 that you'll still be 600 parking spaces short even
23 with the addition of 665. I don't know,
24 Superintendent, can you help me with that?

25 MS. JENSEN: Is that a question?

MR. WILSON: Yeah, I can respond to
that. We're not adding 665 parking spaces, we're
going to relocate approximately 650 parking spaces

1

2 from K Lot, the northern most parking lot at Sandy
3 Hook which we will revegetate as bird habitat to the
4 number of satellite lots on the east side of Fort
5 Hancock and in every case the location of those lots
6 was selected to place them on lands that are
7 previously impacted. Some of them very highly
8 impacted lands during the military years, but there
9 will be no increase in parking.

10 There's 100 spaces that the 1990 planning
11 effort called for to be part of our new museum and
12 visitors center and we'll incorporate those 100
13 lots, but there's no -- that's to support our museum
14 and visitor center. There's no parking added to
15 support the historic leasing, it's merely
16 relocated.

17 MR. CASSARO: One other thing I guess
18 for, Mr. Corrado, is it? I understand from talking
19 to several people that there would be 1,200 cars per
20 day during the week that would be coming out here to
21 support the, you know, the facilities that are being
22 planned for here and the assessment had said that
23 there would be no environmental impact? I seem to
24 think 1,200 cars on a two-lane road coming in and
25 out of here would be substantially a problem.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CORRADO: The numbers of trips that were presented in the environmental assessment, it was like a single representative number. I was called to the assistance of the park service to conduct a traffic impact analysis under this phase of the project and this phase, a traffic impact analysis we look to see, well, is there a fatal flaw in the proposed action or alternatives of that? And the model that my office has used in that assessment is to look at a worst case condition and we even went further to fabricate a worst case of a worst case condition and we looked at the peak -- a peak hour period where the peak of the traffic that would be generated and we placed that under a network -- traffic network model in the area where that would be peaked in a future-based condition and we tested that model and the presumption is if there's a fatal flaw there we need to look further.

We looked under this fabricated, if you will, worst case scenario and did not find a fatal flaw in the future-based condition outside the immediate area of Sandy Hook. There are some statements that are in the environmental assessment which we don't take exception to and it's related to

1
2 how the temporal distribution of those trips, that
3 they're not -- although there are a few and they're
4 presented in the traffic report, there are trips
5 that occur either at different times or in different
6 directions than the, you know, the peaking trips
7 that occur right now like the beach trips or, you
8 know, the journey to work trips that are
9 commensurate with this area.

10 I don't know if I -- there's probably
11 more dialogue in this, but I want to make sure I'm
12 answering your question. You had a number in mind.
13 That number 1,200 I think you mentioned is not a
14 number that was represented in the model that we've
15 conducted to test for impact.

16 MR. CASSARO: Okay. Because I think the
17 1,200 was mentioned in the assessment, but it seems
18 to me the federal government you're representing is
19 more concerned about the approaches to Sandy Hook.
20 I was more or less concerned with the traffic
21 patterns and affect it would have on the side
22 streets and in the two-lane highway going up and
23 down. The approaches from Sea Bright, I know
24 they're gonna redo the bridge to increase the
25 traffic flow instead of the draw bridge; however,

1

2 what will be the impact on the local area here?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CORRADO: I understand that. Yeah,

our are traffic model did specifically focused on the immediate traffic network outside of Sandy Hook and the reason for that is primarily because of this planned bridge rehab project, the New Jersey State DOT project and the fact that the New Jersey State DOT under their current feasibility assessment for this project which will become federally funded established a base, a future-base condition model that they were testing whether or not they had any fatal flaws. That model had a background traffic growth assigned to it.

We needed to or we felt it appropriate to give them specific numbers from Fort Hancock from a potential Fort Hancock lease and to see whether or not under their model those Fort Hancock changed their current assessment of whether or not there's fatal flaws. So, we focused particularly outside of the park. That is the truth on that.

MR. CASSARO: Okay. All right. Thank you, gentlemen, thank you.

MS. JENSEN: Following Mr. Segal will be Paul Collier.

1

2 MR. SEGAL: My name is Ed Segal. I'm the
3 concessionaire at Sandy Hook since 1962. I was with
4 Sandy Hook for ten years until the federal
5 government took over and became the caretaker and
6 I've been with the National Park Service as the only
7 concessionaire for 31 years.

8 My big concern and what I want to ask the
9 park service is not to ensure that I stay as
10 concessionaire, but that the concession continue
11 lease is open for bid separate from the development
12 of Fort Hancock.

13 In other words, small business people bid
14 against me every year. The park service has chosen
15 me each and every bid time four times now, and I've
16 been here 31 years with the park service as the
17 gamble to run the concessions. I've been a
18 satisfactory concessionaire with the National Park
19 Service for 31 years and for -- we're all talking
20 about Fort Hancock, et cetera, et cetera. I'm on
21 the middle line here. I do the best job I can. My
22 son and my daughter and my wife are next to me, we
23 work 12 to 16 hours a day to show the public and the
24 National Park Service that we want to stay, but
25 not -- it's no guarantee for me. It's a bid every

1

2 ten years which I accept I just don't want because
3 the development out at the fort needs some cash
4 flow, that the park service incorporates the beach
5 concessions. That won't be fair to me or the
6 public.

7 This public -- and I'm sure half you
8 people know me from the Segal's Nest. No park has
9 an operator like myself that cares so much for the
10 people and the people will suffer if a small
11 businessman or a family like ours don't run these
12 concessions. We're not \$100 million operation, this
13 is our living. We work hard at it, we're proud of
14 it and we're proud of the park service and we try to
15 work hand-in-hand with them and I feel very much
16 torn on this whole thing here.

17 I want to keep the birds, I want to keep
18 it beautiful, yet I hate to see the buildings come
19 down, but in the meantime, if the park service will
20 remember that 95 percent of the 2.3 million people
21 that come to this park go to the beach only, and let
22 me tell you something else that's a little
23 shocking. 95 percent will never go to Fort
24 Hancock. These are working people. You'll get a
25 small trickle, 10,000 people maybe, if you're

1
2 lucky. This is a whole new thing. These people
3 want their beach, this is their beach club. They
4 don't have any private beach clubs down the road,
5 this is it and the park service provided it for them
6 under President Nixon when he created the Gateway
7 National Recreation Area with the five different
8 parks, I was here and they spoke about it then, they
9 spoke about it in front of congress of putting up
10 \$500 million of ferry service --

11 MS. JENSEN: Your time is up.

12 MR. SEGAL: -- to go to all the Gateway
13 Parks. It was something to give back to the working
14 man, the working class and I realize this and our
15 people, my family, when we run these concessions
16 we're very grateful to the National Park Service,
17 we're grateful to the people of New Jersey and all

18 those that come to our stands and come to the
19 Segal's Nest. By the way, we have about 50,000
20 people --

21 MS. JENSEN: Sir, your time is up.

22 MR. SEGAL: -- a year who come up to the
23 Segal's Nest to enjoy what the park service built.
24 We run it, but they built it.

25 I'm through? Thank you. God bless you.

1

2 MR. WILSON: I'd just like to respond
3 briefly?

4 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

5 MR. WILSON: Ed, thanks for coming. I
6 hope you're here another 31 years.

7 I just want to say that the concession
8 will be competed under our Concessions Authority
9 which dates back to, I think, the 1920's, it was
10 amended in the Thomas Act a few years ago. I know
11 you're familiar with it and that's how we'll be
12 handling that.

13 MR. CASSARO: Thank you very much.

14 MS. JENSEN: Mr. Collier will be followed
15 by Mayor Gregory Harquail.

16 MR. COLLIER: Most of you know me in some
17 capacity or some of you do. I am also, as is Eddie
18 Segal, a member of the board of the Sandy Hook
19 Foundation which has endorsed formally the proposal
20 for the rehabilitation and reuse of Fort Hancock,
21 but I speak for myself as Eddie spoke only for
22 himself, not for the foundation board and I do not.

23 At the previous meeting I made two simple
24 points, one was that we are speaking about historic
25 preservation primarily and not development such as

1

2 the destruction of farms for housing in western
3 Monmouth that's allowed to go on. We're speaking of
4 historic preservation and I believe even the initial
5 objectors understand that point.

6

My other point at the previous hearing
7 was to refute those who said that Fort Hancock and
8 thus Sandy Hook does not have historic
9 significance. That's like saying Federal Hall in
10 New York is no longer historic because it was a
11 building replacing one that burned down and was
12 built in 1842. I don't think that's an issue even
13 for the objectors anymore.

14

Today I want to briefly add another point
15 and it is this. It is the issue of whom we believe
16 and trust in this matter. On the one hand we have
17 the National Park Service requested by congress to
18 find a way to preserve deteriorating facilities in

19

our national parks. It isn't something that the
20 bureaucrats came up with. Our representatives asked
21 for it and the park service responded in the way
22 that Russ Wilson and others have described to you.
23 I will not go into that, but they're responsible,
24 honest servants of the people who came up with a
25 model that's been successful at the Presidio in

1

2 California and other places. So, there is one
3 side.

4

5 On the other side there are some serious
6 people who came very late to the table who paid very
7 little attention to the early beginnings of what has
8 become this plan, the request for proposals. All of
9 the newspaper articles, they show up at the last
10 minute and I will admit that many of them are
11 friends of mine and are respectable people, but
12 there have been some laughable comments in the
13 newspapers.

13

MS. JENSEN: Your time is up.

14

MR. COLLIER: The recent arrived resident
15 who got front page space in a weekly newspaper --

16

MS. JENSEN: Time is up.

17

MR. COLLIER: -- calling for a habitat
18 for humanity and there have been others.

19

MS. JENSEN: Thank you.

20

MR. COLLIER: I place myself with the
21 responsible people in our government who have
22 studied very carefully what we need on Sandy Hook.
23 Thank you.

24

MS. JENSEN: Mayor Harquail will be
25 followed by Judy Stanley Coleman.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MAYOR HARQUAIL: Good afternoon, moderator, distinguished panel. My name is Gregory Harquail, Mayor of the Borough of Sea Bright, a community to the south of Sandy Hook and I am here personally as I have been in the past to wholeheartedly support this project.

As Mayor of the Borough of Sea Bright I am a member of a prestigious group of mayors which consist of 11 mayors from Monmouth County referred to as the Two River Mayors Group or Association and for those people who have missed the article in the newspaper, that prestigious group wholeheartedly supports this project and their primary comment is, it's long overdue. Thank you very much.

MRS. COLEMAN: As a good little wife I'll let my husband go before me.

MS. JENSEN: Oh, you're obviously not going together, okay.

MR. COLEMAN: Thank you very much and thank you superintendent. I had told you yesterday of my commitment.

My name is James Coleman. I am the wife of -- the husband of the -- you got that right -- Judith Stanley. My first comment, I want to

1

2 voice my objection to the membership of one of the
3 person's on this panel.

4

5 Now, I'm well aware of who Mr. William
6 Alexander is and I'm well aware that the Wharton
7 School assisted the government in all their previous
8 doings here as far as finding an acceptable
9 candidate. I'm also aware that he voted for the
10 Wossel Realty Group to get this bid and all that I
11 don't care about, but I care about an article that
12 appeared in the Two River Times on May 10th last
13 where he says, "Unfortunately, it's common for a
14 project such as Fort Hancock which involve a public,
15 private partnership to be publicly criticized for a
16 variety of reasons. Based upon my observation of
17 this partnership, I consider such criticism baseless
18 and without merit." How could you in good
19 conscious, sir, sit on this panel?

20

21 All right. Secondly, Mr. Ochs referred
22 to Wossel Realty and that they were the successful
23 bidder, so to speak, back in August of 1999. There
24 are two veil references to the initials SHP in that
25 proposal, but not until October of 2001, was SHP
brought into existence as a corporation and
incorporated by somebody by the name of Edward S.

1

2 Raisely (phonetic), whose name doesn't appear in any
3 of the papers here. I don't know who the people are
4 in SHP. Wossel Realty Group was a one-man
5 corporation by James Wossel. Isn't it fair to let
6 the public know after two years who they're dealing
7 with?

8

9 We saw all those lofty credits to the
10 people in the original proposal. Are they still
11 with SHP? The attorney yesterday -- and I spoke to
12 him in the presence of Mr. Adlerstein and I strongly
13 disagree that they had a right to assign the
14 proposal and I said if you did and it's in writing,
15 please send me a copy. I don't think they can do
16 that. I don't think you can take a proposal from A
17 and then give a letter of intent to B.

18

19 One last thing. I do think we're
20 entitled to know who we're dealing with. SHP, who
21 are they? Are they financially sound? I don't
22 know, I don't know their names. I only know they
23 incorporated from the state records. So, I really
24 think we're entitled to know that and I thank you
25 for your time and Mr. Wilson, thank you very much
for letting me go out of turn.

26

MS. JENSEN: Is there anybody who wishes

1

2 to comment?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Thank you, Judge, and we will -- our solicitor's office as when we met yesterday, did clearly state that there's nothing out of the ordinary in the way that this is proceeding in terms of the naming, but we will look into that, but in terms of who SHP is, would Jim Wossel clarify who SHP is?

MR. WOSSEL: At our last public meeting I gave an explanation as to what my company is. Wossel Realty Group which was incorporated in 1993, is solely owned by myself and under the constant conversation during our process with the National Park they were well aware that a new entity was going to be formed which is primarily owned by myself, I call it Sandy Hook Partners, but to allow investors to be part of this operation.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Okay. Thanks, Jim.

MR. COLEMAN: 27 months later?

MR. OCHS: If you had, in fact, this letter of intent, would you have formed the group?

MS. JENSEN: I really would like the panel to answer these questions.

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: 20 years later.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADLERSTEIN: I'm not sure if I understand which question was being asked, but the --

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: The first one.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Would someone like to clarify for me what is the question that we're being asked?

MS. JENSEN: The man who was -- the person who was just at the microphone -- oh, that's -- Judge Coleman is on his way out the door.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Yeah, the present state of our discussion with the public is that the park service until we are through with the public review have not signed a lease with anyone so therefore, it's difficult for this -- at this point in time we have not and we legally cannot make the decision that we're gonna proceed with the leasing arrangement or terminate this effort -- can I finish my -- let me just finish.

MS. JENSEN: No, sign up to talk.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- so that we will complete the process and within our process we will -- after the public review is over, we will then issue a -- we'll digest the public comments, we will

1
2 put the public comments into a final plan so
3 everyone can see what the full range of written and
4 comments are at all these meeting and then we will
5 if issue a final plan.

6 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Before or after an
7 award, so that the public will have knowledge?

8 MS. JENSEN: There was another question
9 that --

10 MR. ADLERSTEIN: There will be no award
11 until the final plan is issued and that --

12 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not the
13 point.

14 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Sir, you asked the
15 question, I'm answering the question. We could have
16 this dialogue in my office if you'd like, but --

17 MS. JENSEN: Yes, I think we have to --

18 MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- the final plan will
19 be issued before there's an award or the signing of
20 the lease with Mr. Wossel.

21 MS. JENSEN: There was another question
22 about the appropriateness of Mr. Alexander serving.

23 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Bill, would you answer
24 that?

25 MR. ALEXANDER: First of all, let me

1

2 clarify that my role is consultant to view the
3 financial feasibility of various proposals that were
4 submitted and I am not bitter on a particular
5 developer.

6 Having said that, I did my experience as
7 a contractor and developer. We were part of many
8 proposals throughout my career where we were not
9 successful and I felt that the process was flawed.
10 How can anybody not pick my organization to be the
11 developer on this particular project.

12 Having been present at the deliberations
13 leading up to the selection of the developer on this
14 project I was impressed with the thoroughness, the
15 due diligence, the probing that went into the
16 process. This is not a short-term quick decision,
17 this is one that if I respect a developer and had
18 been unsuccessful, I would one have been
19 disappointed, but I also would have understood that
20 it was the process that was thorough and that led to
21 the comment that I made which was quoted in the
22 newspaper. Thank you.

23 MS. JENSEN: Now we have Judy Stanley
24 Coleman followed by Steve Nolan.

25 MRS. COLEMAN: Thank you. I know that

1

2 you all heard from me a lot and know my position or
3 else you've read about me a lot and so I just have a
4 few key points I'd like to go over and I hope you
5 will not close up your ears like the legendary deaf
6 adder in the Bible.

7 I would like to say to the park service,
8 I do know your mission, but it should be twofold.
9 Buildings are given -- that were given to you by the
10 army, maybe you shouldn't have taken them, but don't
11 forget the land. Are the buildings more important
12 than the land, its ecology, its serenity, its
13 beauty, its open space?

14 It is in this state, New Jersey State's
15 open space plan and Middletown Township which Mary
16 Lou mentioned exists, this is where Sandy Hook is,
17 it's in Middletown Township's open space plan. It
18 is not listed as office space or even the beginnings
19 of a town center. Are the buildings and filling
20 them more important than what they would do also to
21 the surrounding area? Nobody has discussed that,
22 what it will do to the area outside the fort. I
23 know you talked about the fort held 18,000 people at
24 one time in its height, but that's was when our
25 little village -- towns around here were little tiny

1

2 villages, you know, and when the people came out of
3 the fort, maybe they had one car, maybe they didn't,
4 but you have to consider what is in (inaudible) of
5 the community in the meantime.

6

7 The environmental impact study does not
8 address the impact of office buildings upon the
9 environment in the case of Middletown Township. And
10 my 20-year history as chairman of the township
11 planning board, it is the race for ratables and
12 office construction that has lessened the
13 quality-of-life whether it be traffic, more housing
14 because jobs come after -- jobs create the housing
15 and jobs will bring in the demand for more housing
16 in the surrounding areas.

16

17 We already have a lot of open space in
18 Middletown Township. We have Lucent totally gone,
19 we have AT&T totally gone, we have them gone up and
20 down Route 35. No report that I've seen explains
21 the number of people that Mr. Wossel proposes and
22 the cars that will be generated by these 36
23 buildings. And how many more people are you talking
24 about? You're talking about 300,000 square feet
25 now, but how many people, cars and trips? I just
can't figure it out because there are no numbers

1

2 given.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Not addressing the number of people also makes the environmental impact study worthless and I'm sorry, but that traffic study is a farce. I have read many, many traffic -- I don't mean to be mean to you, sir, but I really do read a lot of traffic studies from being the planning board chairman in Middletown and you really are only, you know, discussing the area right here and the trips in and out and nothing much passed the bridge. You're not addressing what's gonna happen to the local streets, the impact up and down Route 36 and I can tell you from the planning board, we have put in in the last year and will be built in the next few years over 500 more condominiums. So, we are looking at an awful lot of traffic that will be going on and I think something, you know, has to be done with that. You've got to address all the increases and egresses and everything that's gonna happen in the local roads.

I read with interest also about Fort Baker in California and they had many of the same questions. They've questioned every single thing that I think most people here have questioned, but

1

2 the public was brought in in the year September --
3 it was September of 2000, and it is still being
4 discussed and I think that our discussions have not
5 been that long and I think there should be more of
6 them, please.

7

MS. JENSEN: Time. Final point.

8

MRS. COLEMAN: I think (inaudible) was
9 really short, so I'm just gonna take a little bit
10 and I promise to be finished.

11

MS. JENSEN: Right.

12

MRS. COLEMAN: I think also that you
13 should come before the planning board back in 1993,
14 when the coast guard added 37 family units here.
15 They had the courtesy to come administratively to
16 the planning board and to discuss it and they
17 listened to our suggestions and nothing like that
18 has been suggested here.

19

I think the lease is too loosely written,
20 it is open season to do whatever they want, any
21 change of use can be written in. And dealing with
22 not-for-profits, and believe you me, you know, I
23 have so many not-for-profits, but they do bare as
24 much traffic and cause as much problem as private.
25 So, we have got to see those numbers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think the other thing that I discovered today, and this is something that I would like to throw out to Mary Lou Strong who serves on the planning board with me. There is a question that when you bring in office buildings and you create jobs, that the question of fair share housing and less school aid pops up, and we do not have that answer yet from the state as to whether with this development, we in Middletown Township will have to pay more taxes and more money.

MS. JENSEN: You've raised some questions that I think the panel might want to address.

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Let me first address the issue of this protect versus the Fort Baker project at Golden Gate. They've both been lengthy processes, but I have to tell you that we started the public review of the additional concepts of issuing this RFP many years ago, long before Fort Baker was even turned over to the National Park Service or before the present leasing process we've been in public discussion.

Of course, it's been more focused since February when we actually did the EA, the environmental assessment for this particular

1

2 development team and it's been far more focused
3 but --

4 MRS. COLEMAN: I think they're back to
5 2000, though, from every report that I've read.

6 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Absolutely. And Fort
7 Baker, it's gone back to 2000 and we've -- the
8 process of discussing a leasing program at Fort
9 Hancock has gone back far beyond -- far longer than
10 from the year 2000, but let me also ask Mary Foley
11 to address the issue about impacts on our natural
12 environment.

13 MS. FOLEY: Well, it's certainly a task
14 for us in the National Park Service to find balance
15 with historic preservation and natural resource
16 preservation. I'm the lead scientist that sits on
17 the natural resource side of the house and it would
18 fine for me if the park service wanted to tear down
19 every house and recreate natural areas, but I've
20 been around long enough to know that certainly we
21 cannot and should not ignore the Historic
22 Preservation Act.

23 I know that the review environmental
24 assessment there have been a number of biologists,
25 reputable, good professionals who have been involved

1

2 in resulting mitigation strategies and alternative
3 ways to deal with some of the -- like the impacts on
4 the natural environment and I think they've done a
5 really excellent job in that. I don't have any
6 concerns about the project, we can go forward
7 without any harmful impacts to the environment. In
8 fact, I think it will actually augment it with
9 restoration of Parking Lot K.

10 MRS. COLEMAN: I just don't understand --

11 MS. JENSEN: Are there any other
12 comments?

13 MRS. COLEMAN: -- why people have to be
14 in buildings to recreate, you know, to reconstruct
15 them. I don't understand that.

16 MS. JENSEN: Thank you very much.

17 MRS. COLEMAN: Can anybody answer that
18 question about the fair share housing thing that
19 Middletown will have to come up with or the loss of
20 school aid? I'd like that answered because then
21 somebody's responsible for it and you don't have to
22 pay for it.

23 MS. JENSEN: That may be something that
24 will have to be answered afterwards.

25 MRS. COLEMAN: Okay. I'm just --

1

2 MS. JENSEN: No, I think your time is up.

3 MRS. COLEMAN: I'm just gonna end by

4 saying Henry --

5 MS. JENSEN: I beg Mr. Nolan's indulgence

6 because Congressman Pallone has arrived and we'd

7 like to give him a chance to speak.

8 MRS. COLEMAN: I'll just say that Henry

9 Hudson said it's a good land to fall in the pond.

10 He might not say that now if he saw what's going

11 on.

12 MS. JENSEN: Go ahead, please.

13 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Thank you very much

14 and I -- you know, I want to apologize for not being

15 able to stay here the whole time because I know how

16 important this is to the residents of Monmouth

17 County and the State of New Jersey and how much time

18 everyone up here, as well as in the audience has put

19 into the issue.

20 I guess I wanted to start briefly by

21 talking a little bit about the process because I

22 think that's been very important over the last few

23 months. I know a number of residents have been

24 concerned about the process and I think it is

25 definitely better today. I think you know that we

1

2 requested this traffic study, we requested that all
3 the information about the various proposals out
4 there be made public and we also asked that the
5 procedure be a little different which it is today,
6 and I haven't been watching it very much, but I hope
7 it's better.

8

I wanted to say that the only problem
9 with that process so far, because I think everything
10 has been improved in terms of all the materials
11 being disclosed now in terms of who's -- the various
12 proposals that were out there is we did, I
13 understand, just get this traffic study either today
14 or maybe yesterday and a lot of people haven't
15 really had the opportunity to look over it and I
16 thought what we would do is to see, you know, what
17 the reaction is today, whether people feel that
18 they've had enough opportunity to see it. If they
19 don't, then maybe we do need to look again at
20 another public hearing, but I wasn't here long
21 enough to see what the response was.

22

Keep in mind, though, keep in mind,
23 though, that the park service has allowed until June
24 15th for public comments, so, you know, you could
25 read the traffic study today and send in written

1

2 comments on it as well, but, again, maybe why don't
3 we wait until after the hearing is over and see how
4 everybody feels about that. I was hoping that the
5 traffic study would be available prior to today and
6 I know it wasn't for most people.

7

 The other thing from a process point of
8 view I wanted to mention is that when I read through
9 the traffic study I did -- it did bother me over the
10 fact that it assumed certain things were gonna
11 happen, particularly the bridge which I guess isn't
12 scheduled to be completed until 2006, something like
13 that, and it did concern me that we were depending
14 on that happening. I mean, given the fact that, you
15 know, the state has very little money and that there
16 are a lot of things that are being cut back, I think
17 it is sort of presumptuous to assume that that's
18 necessarily gonna go forward and that that's gonna
19 be built by 2006.

20

 So, there's another thing that I think
21 the park service has to take into consideration,
22 whether or not these public infrastructure elements,
23 particularly the bridge are really gonna be there
24 and whether or not they have to look at that again
25 in light of the fact that, you know, that that's

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

still several years out and whether or not the money
is gonna be there.

Now, beyond the process, though, let me
go back to a few other things, and some of this came
out as a result of the proposals that have now been
disclosed. I feel in some ways in a very difficult
position here and I guess I'm talking to the park
service in particular because ideologically, it
concerns me that the park service doesn't have
enough money to fix up these buildings on their own
and operate them as a park service and I think --
I'm trying not to be too partisan because I know we
have people on -- you know, of all parties and elks
here in the audience, but I've been very critical of
the current administration in Washington because I
think that not enough money is being devoted to the
park service and to the Department of the Interior
and it's sort of ironic because we now see, you
know, major -- I don't know what you want to call
them, tax breaks, corporate loop holes being given
to major corporations around the country and as a
result of that there's less money for the federal
government to spend on things like the Department of
the Interior and the park service.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, it's sort of ironic that on the one hand we give, you know, big corporate interests a lot of loop holes in terms of taxes, we then have less money for the federal government to spend on things like this that I think are important, but I also understand and I've talked to the superintendent about this, that that's the reality. I mean, the reality is who's in charge in Washington and you have to deal with it and the money isn't available. We've talked about that before, the money isn't available on the federal level right now for the wrong reasons, but it's not available to do all these renovations and improvements that would be necessary if these buildings are gonna come up to snuff.

So, by way of background I want to suggest a few things. I tried to analysis over the last few months why there's so much of an outcry and let me tell you, it's not just the people here today. A lot of people call my office, a lot of people come up to me on the street and say, What's going on? Why do you have to have, you know, business enterprise, corporate enterprise, whatever you want to call it at Sandy Hook? Why can't it

1

2 just stay as a park, you know, for the public that's
3 it,. And I think part of it -- and Mrs. Stanley
4 basically summed it up, I think, is that in Monmouth
5 County I think people everyday are very worried
6 about over development and what's happening.

7

They see more high density development,
8 they see every piece of land -- you know, a lot of
9 land that was farm land before being gobbled up for
10 development and they always saw Sandy Hook as sort
11 of a place that was gonna be beyond that, that
12 wasn't going to be part of that and I think part of
13 the problem that you're facing here is the people
14 are very fearful about what this -- the proposal
15 will be, the one that the park service seems to be
16 choosing.

17

They're not only concerned about the
18 specifics in terms of what's on paper, but also they
19 fear that if it doesn't work and it's not
20 financially viable, that they're gonna come back
21 again and they're gonna say, okay, that didn't work,
22 now we want to build more buildings. Now we want to
23 have more commercialization. So, I guess what I
24 would say in general and then I'll just get to a
25 couple specifics, in general I wish that there was

1
2 an opportunity, and maybe there is, for the park
3 service to sit down once again with me, perhaps with
4 Mrs. Stanley from the Monmouth Conservation
5 Foundation, perhaps with state officials or county
6 officials and see if there is some way for us to
7 look at some repackaging here that would allow us to
8 keep it without, you know, essentially doing the
9 office buildings and the businesses that are being
10 looked at.

11 (Applause.)

12 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Now, I don't -- I'm
13 not -- please. I'm not suggesting that that's gonna
14 work, okay. I don't want to give anybody false hope
15 here. You know, it's at the 11th hour, these guys
16 at the park service has spent a tremendous amount of
17 time looking over proposals and they're kind of --
18 kind of their backs are to the wall because they've
19 got to fix up these buildings and they don't have
20 the money to do it from the federal government, but
21 I'm just asking maybe one more time, you know,
22 before the decision is made over the next month or
23 so that we have an opportunity to bring in some of
24 the people that have talked and see if there's some
25 way to do it differently.

1

2 I only mention that because I remember
3 when we were trying to build the Noah Lab, some of
4 you are familiar with the Noah Lab, and at one time
5 -- this, you know, goes back --

6 (End of Tape No. 1, Side B.)

7 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: -- the time is we
8 went back to the state and the state ended up, you
9 know, paying for part of the cost.

10 Now, of course, the state has no money
11 either, so this is probably unrealistic, but the
12 point I'm trying to make is that maybe at the 11th
13 hour there is some way to put together between the
14 state, the county and private, you know, like
15 Conservation Foundation or something some
16 alternative. Probably there isn't, but let's look
17 at it one more time.

18 Now, let me just mention a couple of
19 things that I wanted to bring up specifically.

20 MS. JENSEN: Quickly.

21 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Quickly, I know. I
22 don't have a lot of time.

23 One is that I did notice that when we had
24 the proposals out, the 20 or so alternatives that
25 were out there, that there were a couple of

1
2 nonprofits like Monmouth County Friends of
3 Clearwater, there was the Aids Resource Foundation
4 that was rejected and that bothered me because it
5 seemed to me that the nonprofits, particularly those
6 that are already here, particularly one like
7 Clearwater that's an environmental group, you know,
8 should have been given sort of a break in terms of,
9 you know, the amount of level of funding that they
10 had to come up with. So, I was gonna ask the park
11 service also to take a look again at some of these
12 existing uses that were out here like Monmouth
13 Clearwater and see if there was some way to
14 incorporate those again.

15 And the last thing that I wanted to
16 mention too is I know that when the superintendent
17 took me on a tour that we had the last time, maybe
18 you did it again today, we did see that some of the
19 buildings like the park headquarters were actually
20 renovated by the park service with some volunteer
21 help and I knew there were some organizations that
22 said they wanted to volunteer to help renovate some
23 buildings so, again, I would say -- I don't know
24 whether or not this proposal that's out there that
25 you seem to want to accept maybe could be scaled

1

2 back so that there could be an opportunity for some
3 of the nonprofits that were here before to still be
4 able to stay like Clearwater, there could be an
5 opportunity maybe to get some voluntary groups to
6 help renovate some of the buildings so it didn't
7 have to be as extensive, so the proposal didn't have
8 to be as extensive as what's been proposed.

9

And finally, and this is the last thing,
10 if you do decide at some point, you know, after all
11 this that you feel you have to go ahead with the
12 proposal that you seem to favor, let's make sure
13 that there's some safeguards in there so that it has
14 a definite length before, you know, it -- as time
15 when it expires, let's also make sure that it
16 can't --

17

AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: 50 years.

18

CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Right, maybe it
19 should be a shorter period of time, also if there's
20 some way, perhaps, to make sure that they can't come
21 back, because a lot of people have said to me
22 they're gonna come back. They're not gonna make
23 money, they're gonna come back and ask for it to be
24 expanded. I think it has to be quite clear that
25 that shouldn't be allowed because I know there's a

1

2 lot of fear about that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

 Again, in conclusion, my concern is that we don't want things to change very much from what the purpose of national parks is all about which is basically for the public to enjoy, to be not profit making organizations and I understand that there may have to be an exception here, but let's limit it if we have to do as much as possible.

10

 MS. JENSEN: Thank you.

11

 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Thank you.

12

 MS. JENSEN: You wish to respond?

13

14

 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't --

15

16

17

18

 MR. WILSON: No, no, that's okay. I just want to respond that we would welcome the opportunity to sit down with you and discuss all these issues.

19

 CONGRESSMAN PALLONE: Okay. Thank you.

20

21

 MS. JENSEN: Mr. Nolan followed by George Moffett.

22

23

24

 MR. NOLAN: Good afternoon. I'm Stephen Nolan. I'm chair of the Jersey Shore Group at the Sierra Club.

25

 As many of you are aware, we submitted

1
2 extensive comments at the last public hearing. I'm
3 not gonna repeat those. In the meantime, since then
4 more information has come out. We focused on the
5 lease and the terms of the lease and, again, as
6 we've pointed out before, there is information that
7 is not being presented to the public and the lease
8 was not complete and there are important things
9 missing in the document and that's what I'd like to
10 address today plus ask one question.

11 The lease document is missing the
12 compensation terms. Those terms have been blacked
13 out so we can't see them. It doesn't provide
14 Exhibit A, Exhibit A has the construction schedule,
15 it doesn't have Attachment One, it has the approved
16 design and construction documents. We would like to
17 see whether the park service is obtaining adequate
18 compensation for the project. We would also like to
19 find out whether the park service receives
20 percentage rent if the partners use one or more
21 buildings rather than subleasing them, we would like
22 to see whether payment of the percentage rent
23 depends on lessee's actual receipt of rental amounts
24 from subleases.

25 Secondly and more important, does the

1
2 compensation scheme provide an incentive to complete
3 the project in a timely manner? Is there minimal
4 compensation coming to the park service as a service
5 charge? If there is minimal compensation coming to
6 the park service as a service charge, Sandy Hook
7 Partners will not have an incentive to rehabilitate
8 the buildings and find tenants.

9 Attachment One is important, it should
10 reveal what the partners plan to do to each of the
11 buildings. We don't know. We have a very general
12 statement in the environmental assessment. We're
13 trying to figure out whether this project is good
14 for the environment and we still don't know enough
15 about it. Exhibit A, another missing document is
16 important because it contains the construction
17 schedule and description of the premises. We're
18 told there will be 36, 37 buildings. We'd like to
19 know whether that is, in fact, in the proposed
20 contract, the lease document with Sandy Hook
21 Partners.

22 So, we need more information and
23 information comes out and that's great, but this
24 process keeps going on and on and on because it
25 doesn't come out in a full manner right from the

1

2 beginning and we would like to stress that more
3 information should be provided.

4

My question relates to the traffic study
5 which we took a look at today. This is the first
6 opportunity we had a chance to review it and I think
7 from what Mr. Corrado says, that the traffic study
8 only focused on the vicinity close to the park
9 entrance, the bridge over the river and the roads up
10 to the toll booth.

11

MS. JENSEN: Okay. Let's -- we'll take
12 your question.

13

MR. NOLAN: So, the question is, the
14 question is, Why didn't the study analyze all the
15 impact that is up Route 36 towards Keyport in that
16 direction because there's traffic up there and
17 there's traffic that will be going that way and
18 there's traffic that's going to go south along Ocean
19 Avenue and there may be impacts from this daily in
20 flow and out flow of traffic.

21

MS. JENSEN: Okay. Traffic pattern.

22

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Okay. Let me address
23 the missing parts of the lease for a second
24 because --

25

MS. JENSEN: I'm glad you got all those

1

2 questions because I couldn't repeat them.

3

4 MR. ADLERSTEIN: I got -- I think I got
the gist of the questions, yeah.

5

6 The attachments for the construction
7 schedule and construction documents are not -- were
8 not attached because they're not done. The lease
9 that we provided is a draft lease. We are legally
10 not allowed to have a lease until we make a decision
11 at the conclusion of this EA process whether we're
12 gonna proceed with this concept. So, therefore, we
13 do not have a lease, we have a draft lease which is
14 missing major sections because we expect that if we
15 do decide to proceed, that they'll be comments that
16 come out of the public review that are gonna affect
whatever goes into the lease.

17

18 So, we're still at a very draft stage of
19 that discussion. We haven't -- we're still in a
20 public debate about the whole premises of the
21 project, so there are missing pieces of the lease
22 and that's because they're not finalized, they're
not done.

23

24 In terms of the treatment of the
25 buildings which is the concern of the construction
documents, let me ask Dan to address that from the

1

2 state's point of view.

3

MR. SAUNDERS: You know, all the projects here are bound by the Secretary of the Interior standards for the treatment of historic properties. There's actually four treatments, but the chosen treatment here is rehabilitation.

8

Each building has a very specific historic character and what the Secretary of the Interior standards really say is that you have to look at a building, you have to identify its historic character and then you have to protect that and I guess what I would tell you about the specific buildings here -- and I've been fortunate, I don't think most of you have been in any of these buildings because they're closed because of their deteriorating condition, but many of these buildings have a great deal of historic fabric in them. If you go in the Officers Row houses an awful lot of them have everything from the butler's pantry to the sink and that constrains the amount of change that can be made and still meet the standards, so there's a fair amount of control there.

24

In terms of reviewing the projects, you know, I'm not part of the park service here. I'm

25

1
2 here -- I'm a regulator who reviews park service
3 projects. Certainly any kind of a change that was a
4 substantial change to these buildings would be an
5 adverse effect. An adverse effect would trigger
6 review by the advisory council on historic
7 preservation and I think would pretty much be a
8 non-starter as a project. So, the developers and
9 the National Park Service both have a set of
10 buildings that have a lot of character both
11 individually and as part of a larger landscape and
12 that landscape is something that's been in the
13 forefront of everybody's minds who's been reviewing
14 these projects.

15 I care deeply about the landscape here.
16 There's a landscape report for treatment of the
17 landscape if this project moves forward, but the
18 buildings themselves by their very historic
19 character constrain and make possible certain kinds
20 of uses and make other uses very unlikely.

21 MR. ADLERSTEIN: In reference to the
22 traffic issue that you raised, could you address
23 that, Frank?

24 MR. CORRADO: You know, the term traffic
25 model is a loose term and it varies from project by

1

2 project and I guess the essence is an appropriate
3 model is a practical model that gives you results
4 that can help you make a statement of findings and
5 traffic model or an activity that involves a traffic
6 operation assessment or analysis has got two
7 components, the demand side and the capacity side.

8

What was performed in this traffic model
9 which was recently made available had some trip
10 generation numbers and there were some assumptions
11 in generating those numbers and then assumptions on
12 how those numbers were used. That defines the model
13 and there could be criticism on the model itself, I
14 just want to, you know, make sure that there's
15 nothing wrong or improper with the numbers
16 themselves.

17

And on the demand side, again, the
18 methodology was let's -- since we're following or
19 trying to build upon a model that the state is
20 currently working on, we wanted to follow the same
21 type of a philosophy, let's find the worst case and
22 just for instance I'll pick out a number, you know,
23 we're saying on a weekend, peak period weekend, a
24 Saturday afternoon, if you will -- I'm sorry, a
25 Saturday morning, if you will, the number of trips

1

2 that -- under these assumptions that Fort Hancock
3 will generate is 184 trips and all those trips are
4 peaking at the same time, they're all by vehicles,
5 they're all -- each trip is one vehicle, they're not
6 sharing rides and those trips occur at the same time
7 that the beach traffic is peaking.

8

 I can't, from this model, say how many
9 trips from Fort Hancock at that time or any other
10 time is generated on the Garden State Parkway
11 off-ramp that's leading down 36. The model just

12 didn't look that far. I had to construe that to be
13 impractical for this only because I'm aligning my
14 model with what the state is considering a practical
15 model for them in assessing their alternatives on
16 replacing the bridge. They have conducted traffic
17 analyses that are associated with their model for
18 their feasibility assessment. They're focusing more
19 on the capacity side and what are the changes by
20 looking at a different type of a bridge. They have
21 already determined what would be representative
22 indicators of traffic areas that would be, you know
23 -- if there's a falacy, these indicators will
24 determine if there's a falacy.

25

 Their model did not go out and say, well,

1
2 what is the change in, you know, the off-ramp on
3 Garden State Parkway south on -- what is that --
4 Exit 117? They've already established a base
5 model. Their model did not accurately or truly
6 represent this development, they looked at a
7 background growth into the future. We felt it
8 appropriate and we found it practical to take these
9 numbers that we generated and, again, there are
10 assumptions associated with these numbers, and apply
11 it to the state's model where the state has already
12 made some statement under public process, I believe,
13 that they're going through a public process that
14 this is how they're assessing their roadway
15 project. I can't, at this point, argue against
16 their approach. I have to take that as an
17 appropriate approach and I'm building upon that.

18 Certainly this -- to go back to the
19 statement of falacy, if the criticism is that this
20 model doesn't accurately represent some issues or
21 indicators that should be represented, then maybe
22 the model does have some falacy, but the state under
23 their current project which is going through their
24 process has developed a model and their assumptions
25 and they're determining these are the indicators of

1
2 traffic impact. That's the model I'm building
3 upon. If there's a need to do more than that, then
4 those things have to be brought forward and brought
5 to consideration to see if that is considered
6 practical and right now the state has this traffic
7 model on their project which has regional
8 implications.

9 If you're certainly changing that type of
10 a facility there are some regional implications
11 associated with it, positive or negative and they
12 have already established what are the indicators to
13 determine if their approach has any fatal flaws. I
14 just had to follow that model and had to consider or
15 do consider that model practical under our
16 assessment to be indicators of whether Fort Hamilton
17 (sic) has fatal flaws, but further to try to stand

18 behind that, we intentionally generated higher
19 numbers than what would actually occur.

20 Now, the reason for that is, you know, I
21 quoted one number 184 trips would come -- 184
22 additional trips will be added to the roadway
23 network at that particular time which is considered
24 a worst case -- I mean, it's a worst case that is
25 considered typical under the state's model and if

1

2 there is criticism that, no, it's probably more than
3 184, then there's a falacy in the model.

4

 MR. NOLAN: I think you're missing my
5 point. I was saying you should examine other
6 intersections than the one right by the bridge and
7 the entrance. Go up Route 36 in both directions and
8 look at the level of service at those intersections
9 and find out how much this project will add and find
10 out whether any of them will become unacceptable.

11

 MR. CORRADO: Right, and I don't disagree
12 with that. Again, we looked at those intersections
13 or those other segments, you know, in some cases
14 they're not signalized intersections, they're ramps
15 themselves, there are merges, there's diverges,
16 there are sections of roadways which form weaves
17 where traffic comes in and needs to cross and goes
18 out. The state -- I'm hoping -- I'm trying to
19 address it. I understand. If there are
20 intersections that we didn't look at, that's because
21 the state's model didn't look at it and --

22

 MR. NOLAN: Well, somebody needs to do
23 it.

24

 MS. JENSEN: I think in the interest of
25 getting everybody's questions and comments in we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

have to call it at that.

George Moffett is followed by Sharon
Berman.

MR. MOFFETT: Good afternoon. My name is
George Moffett. I am a resident of Ocean Port, New
Jersey and a professional beach bump out here at
Sandy Hook for the last 30 years and very much
concerned about the buildings, but I will have to
admit that I am probably no more concerned than
anybody else in this audience, no matter which side
of the proposal you stand on. I do have a number of
questions, however.

I'm concerned by one thing called the
leasing contracts which will be given to the winner
of this proposal. The person as I understand it
will -- the corporation will not get the buildings,
ownership of the buildings, they will have the --
they will be awarded leases and then the
corporation, the developers will then go out and
seek money based on the leases that they have in
hand, that is, to their financiers. Should the
company that has the leases fail in any way, shape
or form, and a number of questions have been raised
about the financial viability of this program, who

1

2 then gets the lease, the mortgage company? And if
3 the mortgage company gets the lease they're gonna
4 come back and say, you know, I've just invested "X"
5 millions of dollars in this facility and National
6 Park Service, I'd like to get my money back. So,
7 that's my first question. Who -- what happens to
8 that lease?

9

Secondly, there has been discussions in
10 this proposal by Wossel Corporation, and
11 incidentally I've been in public relations for 25
12 years and reporter for 15. I'm impressed with this
13 document. I have never seen more smoke and mirrors
14 in my life in 150 pages, but it is a well done bit
15 of smoke and mirrors and I respect that. My
16 question is they're talking about -- oh, they're
17 talking about having a conference center out here.
18 I was a conference manager for about two years. My
19 average membership, my average membership was maybe
20 5,000 people at a conference. I wouldn't want to
21 come out here and have my people having to go from
22 one of those buildings into a conference building
23 in, say, last night's storm or here in the middle of
24 winter drudging through snow.

25

Almost every conference center today has

1
2 to be totally self-contained. In fact, if you want
3 to see pictures of some of the conference centers
4 that are totally contained go to the back of this
5 book because there are a number of pictures in here
6 by the developer of major buildings. I'm showing it
7 upside down. How can this center be viable when it
8 has to compete against all of the other major

9 self-contained centers in this area, including the
10 Hotel Hilton in Long Branch, Eatontown, Tinton
11 Falls? They're surrounded by full service
12 conference centers. This doesn't look like a
13 conference center that's gonna fly. How can that
14 be? How are you picking that as a good use here
15 when it violates all the principles of what it takes
16 to run a good conference center?

17 Why is MASC and the Clearwater
18 Association and the Girl Scouts all being chased out
19 of these buildings when one of the primary purposes
20 of the building is to encourage their use by
21 educational nonprofit? And why are these
22 buildings -- some of these buildings that -- MASC
23 wanted one building and they cannot have it because
24 it's gonna go to the Wossel Corporation, the Marine
25 Fisheries wanted a building to expand and that is

1

2 gonna go to the Wossel Corporation --

3 MS. JENSEN: You've raised a number of
4 questions --5 MR. MOFFETT: -- and Clearwater's been
6 thrown out, why?7 MS. JENSEN: -- now we'll give the
8 answer.9 MR. MOFFETT: Okay. You're right, you're
10 right, you're right, ma'am. Are the next use ratios
11 guaranteed?

12 MS. JENSEN: Okay.

13 MR. MOFFETT: I think we have education,
14 we have nonprofit and business, but everyone here is
15 concerned about this proposal eventually going
16 business. Are these guarantees, these ratios
17 guaranteed or are they gonna be subject to
18 renegotiation down the line when, say, the
19 corporation comes in and says we're having some
20 problems?21 MS. JENSEN: Let them answer your
22 questions now, you've raised so many.23 MR. MOFFETT: I have three minutes to ask
24 my questions.

25 MS. JENSEN: Your time is up.

1

2 MR. MOFFETT: Oh, you didn't tell me
3 that.

4 MS. JENSEN: You have three minutes worth
5 of questions, you'll get a lot of answers.

6 MR. WILSON: I'd like to respond to the
7 questions.

8 MR. MOFFETT: Can I have his three
9 minutes? Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

10 MR. WILSON: When I came in here two
11 years ago I came in here right on the heels of the
12 Seton Hall fires and one of the first things we
13 tried to do was address the concerns along those
14 lines. What federal monies were available we used
15 to put modern fire escapes on our education building
16 which before that just had the old ladders from the
17 army area. If you wonder why I'm bringing this up
18 it's because at the same time we're allowing girl
19 scouts to sleep in a building, multiple girl scouts
20 spending nights in a building that didn't meet
21 modern fire and safety codes. It was totally
22 unacceptable.

23 At the time that we started the summer
24 leasing program out on Officers Row there were 16
25 buildings that went out. They didn't meet fire

1
2 codes, they didn't meet safety codes, but at least
3 they were habitable. At the time we ended that
4 program two years ago only seven of those buildings
5 could barely support -- they were clearly an
6 embarrassment that we the National Park Service
7 would have been branded slum lords if we leased them
8 out. That's why that program came to an end, that's
9 why there's no longer Girl Scouts in those
10 buildings, that's why Clearwater is no longer in
11 those buildings. I'm sorry about that, but that's
12 reality, that's something that just needs to be
13 addressed.

14 Yes, the mixed uses will be guaranteed,
15 they're in the lease. It's not a full-fledged
16 conference center, it wasn't designed to be a
17 full-fledged conference center, it's designed to be
18 a conference facility that's incidental to the other
19 uses which will take place here. It will serve the
20 other tenants, the educational organizations that
21 will come out here and the business groups that will
22 use it. It will also be available when the new
23 ferry dock is constructed to bring in day
24 conferences, but it's not supposed to be nor is it
25 an overnight full-fledged conference center like you

1

2 describe.

3

4

And your first question on lease hold
mortgages. The length -- should Sandy Hook Partners

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

go bankrupt the lending institutions would be able
to manage the leases of the buildings that they lent
on. They won't own them, they'll only have the same
rights that Sandy Hook Partners had. They lent the
money under the lease and they accept that with all
of the safeguards that the National Park Service has
in there, the provision to approve all subleases and
other default safeguards.

13

14

15

16

MR. MOFFETT: Now, the gentleman said I
could have his three minutes, is that acceptable? I
think it happened once before so we have precedence
on it.

17

MS. JENSEN: I need his name.

18

MR. SWAIN: John Swaid.

19

MS. JENSEN: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. MOFFETT: If Sandy Hook has
historically been a recreational facility, and
almost everyone here has very strong feelings about
that, why are 500 parking spaces being taken from
the beach operation and being reallocated throughout
the fort area which is several thousand feet away

1

2 from the beaches thereby reducing the number of
3 parking spaces serving the beaches?

4 MR. WILSON: Let me respond to that.

5 MR. MOFFETT: Certainly. Of course, you
6 own the joint.

7 MR. WILSON: Well, I -- the parking that
8 will be relocated from K Lot into the eastern part
9 of Fort Hancock, some of that parking will be --
10 depends which parking you're looking at, but the
11 bottom line is that much of the parking which will
12 be used by businesses and educational institutions
13 on weekdays will remain open on weekends for
14 beach-goers and if you look at the spacial shift in
15 the parking, some of that parking will be closer to
16 other beach areas than it currently is. We would
17 frequently get complaints from people who parked at
18 the far end of K Lot that how far did we expect them
19 to walk before they got to the beach and actually
20 some of the -- relocating some of the parking down
21 towards the MASC facility will actually place that
22 parking closer to the beach which actually reminds
23 me of something from your last question is MASC is
24 not being asked to leave nor --

25 MR. MOFFETT: No, I didn't say that.

1

2

MR. WILSON: -- are any other of our
current year-round tenants, they're here to say.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. MOFFETT: I didn't say that, but they
were both looking for buildings and certainly their
objectives, their mission meets the need of either
educational or nonprofit and yet we see buildings
that they would like to have to expand being drawn
away out of the pool so it can go to Wossel and that
doesn't make too much sense to me.

11

12

13

14

15

MR. WILSON: I speak to MASC on a weekly
basis. I'm not aware nor have they ever
communicated to me that they're necessarily
interested in expanding. I just -- I think that's a
mistake, sir.

16

17

18

MR. MOFFETT: I understand they were at
the point where they were going to actually start a
capital fund program.

19

20

21

MR. WILSON: If they are it's -- no one's
communicated to us that their capital fund program
is in debt more space.

22

23

24

25

MR. MOFFETT: Okay. Then I will withdraw
that observation, then okay. My other question,
then, is in this paper here I notice a number of
references to Seton -- not to Seton, to Rutgers

1
2 University and to Brookdale and I got the impression
3 that Rutgers and Brookdale was part of the proposal,
4 at least they were part of the Wossel Organization
5 and yet in careful reading, again, cutting through
6 the smoke and mirrors I didn't see anything that
7 specifically said, other than the fact that someone
8 called up somebody at Rutgers and someone called up
9 someone at Brookdale, any involvement by either of
10 those educational institutions. I got this very
11 strong impression -- the reason I'm asking the
12 question is, are they involved in any way, shape or
13 form in this program? Because there's nothing in
14 here other than very vague and many numerous
15 references to those two educational facilities.

16 MR. WILSON: I speak to Rutgers on --
17 probably twice a week and the Brookdale/Rutgers
18 Oceanographic Center which is a joint venture
19 between the two educational institutions is very
20 interested in locating here and they're looking
21 forward to negotiating with the Sandy Hook Partners
22 on new renovated space which they could not raise
23 the capital to renovate.

24 MR. MOFFETT: One other question was that
25 the Wossel Realty principals, at least the ones

1

2 listed in here, only one person seems to be
3 identified with a historical restoration project,
4 that was a building down at Princeton University.

5 Now, I've rebuilt a seven-bedroom house
6 and that doesn't make me a historical
7 preservationist, I assure you. How -- all of the
8 other principals, all the other people whose
9 biographies were listed here have done major, major
10 malls, high-rise buildings, hotels. No one here
11 accept for that building in Princeton seems to have
12 been on a restoration project, so why is Wossel that
13 apparently has no experience in this field according
14 to their own materials...

15 MR. WILSON: Why don't we ask --

16 MR. MOFFETT: And then my last question
17 is, why do we have an environmental impact statement
18 if this facility out here is such an important and
19 fragile environment? It seems to me that an EIS is
20 absolutely essential for anyone to determine what
21 kind of impact any kind of construction or building
22 would have on this area. And those are my
23 questions.

24 MS. JENSEN: Okay.

25 MR. WILSON: Is that the end of the

1

2 questions?

3

MS. JENSEN: We have two more.

4

5 MR. WILSON: Okay. We're gonna answer
those last two questions, but I want -- okay.

6

MS. JENSEN: Go ahead.

7

8 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Yeah, under the NEPA
process, the National Environmental Policy Act
9 process, we begin an environmental assessment and we
10 consider all of the possible impacts on the project
11 and if at the end of the project after we've looked
12 at mitigation measures, and Dr. Foley spoke to this
13 earlier, we're unable to make a finding of no
14 significant impact, then we necessarily go to an
15 environmental impact statement, but that's simply
16 the way the process works and we're in the middle of
17 the process right now and this public hearing is
18 part of that and your comments are part of that
19 process and help us as we move towards that
20 determination.

21

22 MR. MOFFETT: But the EA, whatever it was
that I paid \$5.00 for said there was no reason for
23 an EIS.

24

25 MS. JENSEN: You had one more question
about the names listed on the --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILSON: Yeah, I think we're gonna invite Jim Wossel to step up to the microphone and answer that, if he would like.

MR. MOFFETT: Am I'm done?

MS. JENSEN: You are, yes, thank you.

MR. WOSSEL: In response to the people involved in the project, and actually this may even fall back to the other question about Sandy Hook Partners, who they are. The people whose resumes are in the proposal are in majority the people who are in partnership and part of Sandy Hook Partners and I don't understand how you could derive by reading that how only the Plumber House was selected.

There are four members of our team that were involved in Fanny Hall Marketplace in Boston and South Street Seaport in the historical restorations and management and leasing programs there and the development and leasing at Paver Center which is an extension of Larimer Square in Downtown Denver and the development team and leasing at the Old Train Station in St. Louis.

Architecturally our architect Bob Kelner (phonetic) who was a graduate of Arizona State

1

2 School of Green Architecture was involved in part of
3 the restoration of the Plaza Hotel, so I think
4 there's quite a bit of evidence as to our
5 experiences in terms of historic restoration and
6 rehabilitation.

7 MS. JENSEN: We'll have our next speaker
8 which is Sharon Bernam followed by Thomas
9 Gruenenfelder.

10 MS. BERNAM: Good afternoon. My name is
11 Sharon Bernam and I'm executive director of the
12 Monmouth Conservation Foundation. I was here at the
13 last public meeting and I've just come back to
14 restate the concerns we have then and now.

15 We have a very fragile ecosystem out here
16 and we feel strongly that with the possibility of
17 commercialization it could destroy a lot of what we
18 do have. We've asked -- what we've asked is that if
19 the project is approved and goes through we'd like
20 to see easements placed on the property to make sure
21 that nothing else can be done. I know the lease
22 states that there's certain uses of the land, but
23 those uses, even though you say they can't be
24 changed, administrations change and legislation
25 changes and there are possibilities that it could

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

be.

Now, I also -- when I mentioned this once before about easements on the property was told that, Well, the National Park System doesn't put easements on their own property, they take care of it. Well, I don't know that that's true. We've seen municipalities that don't take care of the land they own, they turn them into senior citizen housing and other buildings that go on property that should have been saved as just what it is, fragile ecosystem.

The concerns are what have been voiced over and over and over, what is gonna happen with this property? We see what's in the lease, but what if it doesn't work? What if somebody comes back to you? What if they make that choice and that change? We really would like to see you do something about that, maybe form an oversight committee that's gonna watch what happens with the properties. The lease right now the way it is reads very loosely is our feeling. Also, the percentages of the type of businesses that can come in, if you read it it could lead to only one percent of nonprofit and educational and you have to be very

1

2 careful with that because that pushes out everyone
3 you're saying you want in here.

4

I applaud Congressman Pallone for asking
5 to find another way. I would love to say that let's
6 get together and make that happen, it would be
7 wonderful. I hope I have a chance to be a part of
8 that.

9

The last thing I really want to say here
10 is that we the people own the national parks. It is
11 us. I think that we have a right to demand that our
12 parks are protected from being commercialized and I
13 think that part of this process, and this is a
14 personal statement from me, not as executive
15 director, has really been way out of line and very
16 patronizing and I resent it personally.

17

MS. JENSEN: There was a question of
18 oversight and quotas for usage.

19

MR. ADLERSTEIN: I'd like to respond to a
20 few of those. The National Park System has been
21 around since the founding of Yellow Stone in 1872,
22 the National Park Service has been in existence
23 since 1916, and I think that we deserve at least a
24 little bit to stand on our record. We're not in the
25 condominium business, we're not in the strip mall

1

2 business, we're here with a mandate from congress to
3 protect the national and historic landmark
4 structures on their footprints in this park and
5 that's what this lease sets out to do and that's
6 what the draft -- excuse me, that's what this
7 project sets out to do and that's what the draft
8 lease protects.

9

Congress does provide a number of
10 safeguards and allows the public oversight of the
11 National Park Service when we set out on a venture
12 like this. That's why we're here today, this
13 meeting is part of the National Environmental Policy
14 Act oversight of the public on the proposed
15 project.

16

Congress has also provided oversight in a
17 different manner under the National Historic
18 Preservation Act and that act gives the State of New
19 Jersey, through the historic preservation officer
20 whose office Dan Saunders sits at this table and
21 represents, significant oversight of this project
22 which they are exercising throughout this project.
23 So, there are many safeguards already in place akin
24 to easements, but it's congress who controls the
25 disposition of federal property or small interests

1

2 like easements and it would take an act of congress
3 to give easements to anybody on any federal land
4 anywhere. But, again, congress has spoken about
5 oversight under the National Environmental Policy
6 Act and the National Historic Preservation Act.

7

 MR. WILSON: Before you -- let me just
8 add one more comment, if I could. The authority --
9 the leasing proposal that we're discussing has been
10 implemented in numerous national parks, each one of
11 which is presently operating successfully.
12 There's -- and I understand the concern the public
13 has about having a private sector involved in
14 national parks, but the successes have been so far
15 without exception.

16

 We've had leasing, successful leasing at
17 the Presidio, at Gettysburg, at Minuteman, at
18 Kiyahuga, at Chadahochie, at Independence, at Valley
19 Forge and many other national parks. Those are the
20 once I could think of off the top of my head, and
21 then there's a few that are under discussion right
22 now at Fort Baker, here at Ellis Island soon to be
23 discussed. These proposals, each are contentious
24 and the government needs to be discussed -- these
25 proposals offered by the National Park Service needs

1

2 to be discussed like this, but for the record these
3 have been very successful and the public is very
4 pleased with these proposals. Yes, sir.

5

MR. GRUENENFELDER: Thank you. My name
6 is Tom Gruenfelder, I'm a private citizen I live
7 in Rumson. If you come out here on an early fall or
8 spring morning you're likely to find me poking
9 around in one place or the other.

10

I'm going to address initially at least,
11 the environmental assessment, the document. If I
12 have time I may make some other points. I read the
13 environmental assessment. I find it completely
14 inadequate. I'm afraid it's gonna have to be
15 redone. If that means an environmental impact
16 statement, fine. It should also be redone by an
17 organization that has no commercial interest in the
18 outcome of this project. Why do I say this? I say
19 this because there are a number of conclusions put
20 forth in the environmental assessment.
21 Unfortunately, the conclusions are not backed up by
22 any data within the assessment and, in fact, one can
23 -- using the information in the assessment one can
24 arrive at opposite conclusions, at the direct
25 opposite conclusions and support them at least as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

well with the information in the assessment, okay.

So, let's go through the conclusions one by one, okay. There's two classes here, one is environmental impacts where simply the conclusions are not being supported. There's also a set of alleged socioeconomic and financial impacts and these are all highly speculative, so I'm not sure how we can seriously really entertain them, but in the environmental area we see a conclusion and I'll quote, "Natural vegetation and wildlife habitat will be most significantly impacted, but mitigated. There would be only minor and short-term impacts on endangered and other species of special concern."

So, let's analyze that statement. First of all, it talks about mitigation. It says everything's gonna be mitigated. That's not true. We're gonna be doing utility construction within 50 yards of a piping plover nesting area, okay. Construction means maintenance. That means we're gonna be coming back two years, three years, in some time frame we're gonna be doing maintenance in that area as well, so this is an ongoing thing. We're within 50 yards of an endangered species nesting area and there's just no evidence at all provided

1

2 that we're not coming to close, okay. We're just
3 supposed to accept that.

4

5 We are bringing 800 cars into the park,
6 additional cars, I'm sorry, additional cars into the
7 park every morning and they're leaving the park area
8 in the evening. That's a lot of traffic is gonna go
9 by some very good wildlife habitat within this park
10 and I saw nothing in the EA that says that the
11 effects of that increased traffic is gonna be
12 mitigated.

12

13 There are other environmental impacts
14 that are not even identified much less mitigated.
15 There is mention in the assessment that Sandy Hook
16 is an important stop over on the Atlantic flyway, a
17 migratory bird route running both directions, north
18 and south. There's nothing, though, which even --
19 not even an attempt to determine what impact this
20 proposal would have or any of these proposals would
21 have on Sandy Hook's use as part of the flyway.

21

22 Second conclusion. Natural resource
23 impacts would result primarily from construction of
24 new parking lots. We've already seen we're doing
25 some utility construction which is getting awfully
close to nesting areas. We're seeing increased

1
2 traffic. Most of that's gonna occur during early
3 morning, early evening --

4 MS. JENSEN: Please, finish.

5 MR. GRUENENFELDER: -- as rush hour
6 traffic is gonna be occurring at the times wildlife
7 is most active it's gonna have an effect. We
8 certainly can't say it's not gonna have an effect
9 without bringing forth some data.

10 MS. JENSEN: Thank you.

11 MR. GRUENENFELDER: Is that time?

12 MS. JENSEN: Yeah, sorry.

13 MR. GRUENENFELDER: Thank you.

14 MS. JENSEN: I forgot to get somebody on
15 deck. Judy Kramer --

16 MR. WILSON: I'd like to just respond
17 briefly.

18 Sir, the nearest construction that would
19 come from this proposal to piping plover habitat is
20 the restoration of K Lot. Aside from that there's
21 no -- all construction is up here in the Fort
22 Hancock area and not down anywhere near the piping
23 plovers.

24 MR. GRUENENFELDER: Actually, I've got a
25 comment on that, I ran out of time, so -- but I

1

2 thank you for your response.

3

4 MR. WILSON: And to any other of the
5 mitigation of wildlife concerns, I would just ask
6 Dr. Foley, again, to briefly address that.

7

8 MS. FOLEY: I don't see any impacts in
9 the current natural area, only an enhancement at K
10 Lot. So, within the historic core that's where the
11 activity will occur and there's really not much
12 habitat there to disrupt and any small pieces of
13 habitat which I think is one lot near the coal pits
14 will be mitigated. The plants of concern, they will
15 be replanted else where and be used as a vegetation
16 source for K Lot. So, within the historic core I
17 really don't have any concerns.

18

19 The natural areas -- I'm sorry. The
20 natural areas will largely be -- entirely be
21 undisturbed.

22

23 MR. GRUENENFELDER: I'd like to know
24 you're aware that when you rehabilitate Lot K that,
25 you know, when that rehabilitation gets done and
26 what's being found is rehabilitated habitat is not
27 bringing in wildlife the way the original habitat
28 did, so when you say you're gonna rehabilitate K,
29 that's --

1

2 MS. JENSEN: I'm sorry, you can't have
3 three minutes standing and three minutes sitting.
4 Judy Kramer, are you here?

5 MS. PALMER: Hi. I'm not Judy Kramer,
6 I'm Carol Palmer, but she did give me a statement to
7 read which I can't find at this time because you
8 surprised me. Can you give me just a second to
9 locate her statement and call the next person,
10 please?

11 MS. JENSEN: Joe Reynolds. Stay nearby.

12 MR. REYNOLDS: Hi. My name is Joe
13 Reynolds, resident of Atlantic Highlands.

14 I just have a couple comments and then
15 two quick questions to ask. First of all, I'm a
16 little disappointed that on the board over here
17 there's really only one person that comes out saying
18 they're environmentalists and that's Mary over
19 there. And though I don't know Mary personally, I'm
20 sure she'd be happy to have more people who are
21 environmentalists, environmental scientists,
22 ecologists, oceanography people, more people to help
23 out on this important project that's going on. I'm
24 a little disappointed that this is a major project
25 going on here at Sandy Hook and yet there's only

1

2 really one person, environmentalist who's looking at
3 this. So, it would be nice to have more people,
4 more environmentalists, more naturalists looking at
5 this project who are coming out here.

6

MS. FOLEY: Can I just interrupt there.
7 I think in my earlier statement I did point out that
8 there were a number of biologists working on this
9 project, not only the park service, but state
10 biologists and others that all --

11

MR. REYNOLDS: But they're not named and
12 I can't approach them. They work with you, but
13 they're not named in any reports that I know of.

14

MS. FOLEY: Well, there are letters, you
15 know, documenting that in the end of the report.

16

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, not the reports that
17 I've seen, so, you know, I don't know, you know, how
18 many reports are coming out here. But also on the
19 EA as well too, I don't see any sort of names on
20 that where there's any sort of information that I
21 could contact people and find out names.

22

MS. FOLEY: Well, there's letters from
23 the Fish and Wildlife Service, there's letters from
24 the State DEP, I believe it's the Department of
25 Environmental Protection, they all commented on the

1

2 EA and, you know, participated in the reuse. So,
3 you could read those letters at the end of the EA.

4

MR. REYNOLDS: Yeah, well, I also have a
5 couple -- then if that's the case, I also have a
6 couple questions here too, then, how would they
7 comment on non point pollution? I didn't see
8 anything done on non point pollution. I think at
9 this point in time all the oil and the fertilizers
10 and any sort of trash or dog feces that's being
11 collected here on Fort Hancock is currently going
12 out into the Sandy Hook Bay. So, with the added
13 developments being done here, cars, more oil, more
14 fertilizers, more dog feces or animal feces that's
15 being done here, what's the park service gonna do
16 about non point pollution then? Is it gonna have --
17 how is it gonna deal with non point pollution?

18

That's part of Phase II, I think, of the
19 Clean Water Act and I think that's an important
20 thing to bring up and so if all these people, all
21 these biologists that Mary's pointing out commented
22 on that, how did they comment on non point
23 pollution, Phase II of the Clean Water Act? .

24

No. 2 is traffic. I think numerous
25 people brought up traffic problems over here and I'd

1
2 just like to say on the main road that comes into
3 Sandy Hook, Hartshorne Drive, I think that's the
4 name of it, I might be mistaken about it, during the
5 weekday school children come here to visit Sandy
6 Hook and you'd get a dozen schools here visiting
7 Sandy Hook during the weekdays. If people are
8 coming in and out going to work here at Fort Hancock
9 you're gonna be adding a lot more cars as this
10 person, the traffic expert pointed out here. You
11 know, right now currently children are having a hard
12 time crossing that road, they have to wait there
13 five, ten minutes --

14 (End of Tape No. 2, Side A.)

15 MR. REYNOLDS: -- broken legs or even
16 dying when cars are racing by here to come here to
17 Fort Hancock from people working. So, that's an
18 important part of traffic that I'd like to see
19 handled here that's not really being done at this
20 point in time. I know the bridge and everything
21 else, but how's it gonna impact the people that want
22 to go from the ocean side to the bay side to learn
23 and to study, to fish, to swim, to do everything
24 that people want to do here for recreation and
25 education?

1

2 MS. JENSEN: Let's get your questions
3 answered.

4 MR. WILSON: Non point pollution, I mean,
5 the most significant area of non point pollution
6 that we consider part of the environmental
7 assessment is the parking issue and we've committed
8 to study what -- in what areas we'll use permeable
9 rather than paved foundations and what areas we will
10 pave and if we do pave, we'll use catch and
11 evaporation basins and we're gonna do -- it's in the
12 EA that we will consider the best -- and utilize the
13 best practices that we can identify depending upon
14 what sort of parking it is, whether it's permanent
15 parking or, you know, that it's to be used seven
16 days a week, five days a week, weekend visitors or
17 whether it's just occasional parking for events
18 where perhaps a permeable surface would be better.
19 You know, we really don't anticipate that the
20 leasing is gonna bring more dogs to Sandy Hook.

21 MR. REYNOLDS: What about trash?

22 MR. WILSON: What about trash? I really
23 don't see a significant issue of trash outside of
24 the buildings, you know, that we have -- that we
25 would have now.

1

2 MR. REYNOLDS: Well, right now it's carry
3 in and carry out; right?

4 MR. WILSON: Right, and certainly the --
5 we actually just did a brand new -- a brand new
6 approach to that, Operation Heathy Beach. If you
7 haven't seen the signs I encourage you to drive down
8 to the beach and --

9 MR. REYNOLDS: Well, what I see on the
10 beach is a lot of trash, so how is that gonna impact
11 Fort Hancock?

12 A PANEL MEMBER: People that lease
13 buildings will have to contract to have the trash
14 hauled off Sandy Hook just like the people who
15 currently lease at Sandy Hook. We said all along,
16 you know, the trash doesn't change whether it's an
17 office or nonprofit or an educational institution,
18 we all generate some paper waste and the commitment
19 to sustainability was one of the points that was
20 included within the panel's consideration of the
21 lease proposals.

22 I'd like to just move on briefly to your
23 issue about traffic and children. We're aware of
24 that and we're taking steps to do that. The park
25 recently purchased crossing signs at each of the

1

2 crossing, pedestrian crossings across Hartshorne
3 Drive and also the revenue -- part of the revenue
4 that comes from the lease is a reimbursement in lieu
5 of taxes which will help us employ more rangers who
6 enforce our safety regulations and patrol throughout
7 the park.

8 MS. JENSEN: Next is Carol/Judy followed
9 by Robert Riker.

10 MS. PALMER: Hi. Carl Palmer, Judy
11 Kramer had a conference to attend. She asked me to
12 read a statement into the record for her.

13 Judy Kramer is a 20-year resident of
14 Monmouth County. She's the president of Monmouth
15 County Council of Girl Scouts. In Judy's words:
16 "While I understand that we have a great
17 opportunity to preserve and rehabilitate this
18 historical and cultural treasure here in Monmouth at
19 Fort Hancock I feel I must speak on behalf of
20 residents with whom we share this beautiful piece of
21 real estate, those being the shore birds, the wide
22 variety of Marine life, migratory bird populations
23 that all use Sandy Hook as temporary and permanent
24 homes.

25 "These are fragile and complex

1
2 ecosystems here at Sandy Hook. They need our
3 protection and must have support. This
4 redevelopment cannot be just about buildings. We
5 and our children will suffer if we do not also make
6 it about trees, shrubs, fish, molus, piping plovers,
7 some song birds and all the tiny creatures that our
8 children love to watch while on the beaches and
9 nature trails on the peninsula.

10 "I have and many of you have watched
11 Monmouth County change in the past decades. It no
12 longer has the beautiful green open areas some of us
13 fell in love with when we first settled here.
14 There's no redevelopment and certainly no
15 development without great cost to wildlife and
16 wildlife habitat. If we do not protect the special
17 interrelationships of flora and fauna in this very
18 special part of our county we will all suffer. We
19 will lose ecological complexity, we will suffer a
20 decreased quality of air and water and we will
21 damage the beauty of this area for our children and
22 our children's children.

23 "I do not feel we can simultaneously
24 support this rehabilitation project and also protect
25 and preserve the flora and fauna that are important

1

2 to all of us. We all know that increased traffic,
3 activity, business and general use of this area will
4 have a negative impact on the natural
5 environmental.

6 "In closing, I do not support
7 development of one of the few natural historical
8 unique parts of our state. This is public land that
9 should not be put to private for-profit use." And
10 I'd like to submit this statement for your record.

11 (Pause.)

12 MS. PALMER: Okay. First, I mean, I
13 don't have a prepared statement for tonight and I'd
14 love to give Mr. Ochs my time and if there's any
15 left over, please take it, okay.

16 MS. JENSEN: He's already had double
17 so...

18 MS. PALMER: But I am concerned, is there
19 a transcript being kept here?

20 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

21 MS. PALMER: Okay. So, all of this is
22 going on tape?

23 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

24 MS. PALMER: Okay. Is this gonna be
25 available to the public?

1

2 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

3 MS. PALMER: When?

4 MS. JENSEN: I announced that at the
5 beginning.6 MS. PALMER: I'm sorry, I missed that.
7 When will that be available? So, can that be taken
8 away from my time, then, if you announced it in the
9 beginning?10 MR. WILSON: We can make it available
11 after we receive it, it's just available at the cost
12 of reproduction.13 MS. PALMER: Okay. So, it will be
14 available before June 15th I presume; right?15 MR. WILSON: In the back, do you know
16 what the lead time is on it? Do you folks do the
17 transcribing or we hire the transcription company?
18 So, I can't address that.19 MS. PALMER: Okay. I understand
20 Mr. Moffett before I got here was very eloquent
21 about protesting in this public hearing and as far
22 as documents not being available in time for this
23 public hearing.24 In opening statement I'd like to make is
25 there are about 500 pages at least, of documentation

1

2 on this project for the public to see. It's not all
3 available to the public. The traffic study, I
4 believe, came out two, three days ago doesn't even
5 have a date on it, it just says May 2002.

6 Under the Municipal Land Use Law in the
7 State of New Jersey, which this RFP says they would
8 like to observe the state laws and the county and
9 local laws, under the Municipal Land Use Law if an
10 applicant comes before a jurisdiction for
11 development they need to have ten days prior notice
12 and all documents in before they have a public
13 hearing. I would like to know when has a public
14 hearing been published for this? Not when it came
15 out in the Gateway Website, but Fort Baker came out
16 with public notice in the National Register. When
17 have these hearings been noticed either in local
18 papers, the National Register, in the legal notice
19 section. Not by putting out press releases, but
20 actual legal notice? Can anybody answer that
21 question for me?

22 MR. ADLERSTEIN: Yeah, I mean, the
23 initial meeting that we held on this --

24 MS. PALMER: On the 20th?

25 MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- project -- excuse

1

2 me?

3

4 mean?

5

6 MR. ADLERSTEIN: April 20th was announced
7 in the press and then we were asked for extensions
8 and we've -- there's been enormous coverage of the
9 dates for these meetings. As we get requested to
10 have additional meetings we've been scheduling them
11 and putting them out in the press.

12

13 MS. PALMER: But not as a legal public
14 notice?

15

16 MR. ADLERSTEIN: We're not -- this is
17 not -- we're not required under this process to
18 issue these legal public notices and there wouldn't
19 have been time anyway to do these -- to get the
20 public -- to get the legal public notice. Everyone
21 who is interested in this project has -- is clearly
22 showing up for the public meetings. We're not doing
23 this in a dark room.

24

25 MS. PALMER: Well, I'm thinking about
legal requirements under the law.

26

27 Now, the National Register evidently
28 published all the information on Fort Baker and then
29 the situation out in California with the

1

2 rehabilitation and I consider that a public notice
3 in the federal register. I consider it a legal
4 notice. I mean, I'm just wondering why the federal
5 government doesn't comply with the state and local
6 laws of this.

7

MR. WILSON: Well, I suggest you're
8 putting form over substance. We're not required to
9 go under the federal register, but there's very few
10 people in this room that read the federal register.
11 Most of those people read the Asbury Park Press, the
12 Two River Times and many of the local weekly papers
13 and we've had extensive coverage in those papers and
14 we've tried to get the word out to those papers in
15 each and every instance.

16

MS. PALMER: Okay. Press releases are
17 one thing. I think you should be held to do legal
18 notices the way that anybody else would.

19

MR. WILSON: We also took out ads in the
20 papers.

21

MS. PALMER: : Okay. From what I
22 understand the Two River Mayors Group just spoke a
23 few minutes ago and endorsed this project. Again, I
24 reiterate, the full documentation, the full
25 background on this study on this project has not

1
2 been available in sufficient time for the public to
3 go through this for a three-minute comment on a
4 project that's gonna take over our public lands for
5 60 years and this is unconscionable. Therefore, I
6 agree with Congressman Pallone and I believe we
7 should have an extended public hearing after all the
8 documents have been made available to the public and
9 we can come and ask questions of the professionals
10 that prepared it.

11 The gentleman before me mentioned there's
12 no environmentalists up here, there's no biologists
13 up here. There's nobody even as an expert as far as
14 the waste water treatment is concerned. There are
15 conflicting statements in the EA as far as the
16 environmental assessment as far as the waste water
17 treatment plan is concerned. The capacity is only
18 to 189,000, but the EA says, oh, guess what, you're
19 gonna have 1,200 extra people here. At 75 gallons
20 per day, that means you go over your permitted usage
21 of 189,000 which means you have to amend the
22 regional water quality management plan and the waste
23 water management plan which requires more public
24 hearings.

25 So, you haven't fully assessed the

1

2 discharge, you haven't fully assessed the usage and
3 your own EA, your own environmental assessment
4 contradicts this. Can anybody address that?

5 MR. WILSON: Ma'am, if I'm not mistaken,
6 you spoke at the last public meeting, didn't you?

7 MS. PALMER: Yes, I did.

8 MR. WILSON: And you asked us to bring in
9 experts on the various aspects of the plan, is
10 that --

11 MS. PALMER: Yes.

12 MR. WILSON: -- is my memory correct?

13 MS. PALMER: Yes.

14 MR. WILSON: And that's what we've tried
15 to do here today.

16 MS. PALMER: But I also asked about
17 sewerage last -- is there anybody here --

18 MR. WILSON: And it's my recollection
19 that we also addressed sewerage of the plan, that we
20 have a state-of-the-art treatment sewerage facility
21 that's capable of handling the capacity that's
22 generated by the leasing effort and at the last
23 meeting we also spoke to the various methods that we
24 would use, such as low-flow toilets and all this
25 modern technology that's available to bring our --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to keep our plan within compliance.

And there's some things we didn't discuss at the last meeting like we've had rain water leaching into antiquated sewerage lines within the park, so we're currently treating just tons of groundwater, the leaches in the system and that we have an appropriation that we're currently working under, I think it's a \$1.2 million appropriation area, it's our Project No. 225 and we're upgrading all of these old lines with modern liners and replacing them and the sewerage treatment plan will treat the sewerage, state-of-the-art treatment within the parameters when the leasing is finished.

MS. PALMER: Okay. I appreciate that, I really do, but your own EA says that the capacity right now, the highest capacity issue is 110,000 gallons. You were allowed 189,000 gallons in your present permit. You're going to have another 90,000 added to that 110 which puts you at 200,000 which puts you at 11,000 gallons over your discharge capacity permit which means you have to go amend the waste water management plan for this area and the water quality management plan. I would like the public to be aware of that when you do that and I do

1

2 not think that you can have -- you can say you're
3 state-of-the-art and operating under capacity when
4 your own EA says in here you're gonna be 90,000
5 gallons over your highest maximum discharge is right
6 now which is 100,000.

7 MS. JENSEN: Your time is up.

8 MS. PALMER: Okay. On that note I'm
9 gonna to -- is my time and the Judy's time up --

10 MS. JENSEN: Yes.

11 MS. PALMER: -- or Judy's time is up?

12 MS. JENSEN: No, no.

13 MS. PALMER: Both?

14 MS. JENSEN: Yeah.

15 MS. PALMER: Oh, wow. Okay. I have a
16 lot more to say and I think a lot of people here
17 have a lot more to say. There are, as I said, over
18 500 pages of documents here and you cannot expect
19 the public to ask questions of experts in three
20 minutes for a project that's gonna take public lands
21 out of public hands and put them in private pockets
22 for 60 years. So, please --

23 MS. JENSEN: The rest of your comments
24 can be made in writing up until June 15th.

25 MS. PALMER: Okay. Please, Ms. Jensen,

1

2 please Ms. Jensen, if you have any influence over
3 this panel, please take Congressman Pallone's
4 suggestion, have another public hearing so that you
5 don't have the perception of impropriety and not
6 full disclosure for the public. Thank you.

7

MS. JENSEN: Thank you. I'll ask that
8 there been no new names taken in the lobby because
9 we have a sufficient list that will take us through
10 our time. Robert Riker followed by Sue Goldberg.

11

MR. RIKER: My name is Bob Riker of
12 Rumson. I have questions for three members of the
13 panel. Would the chairlady please advise me as to
14 whether their responses come off my three minutes?

15

MS. JENSEN: They do not.

16

MR. RIKER: Thank you. First to
17 Mr. Corrado. The transportation engineer's trip
18 generation handbook provides hundreds of trip
19 generators recognizing that different types of
20 business, educational and recreational activities
21 generate different amounts of traffic. Is your new
22 analysis a traffic study based on assumptions of the
23 different activities that will be taking place in
24 all 36 buildings to be redeveloped by Mr. Wossel?

25

MR. CORRADO: The trip generation

1

2 analysis did use the institute transportation
3 engineer's trip generation methodology. For every
4 single building a trip gen was generated using the
5 most appropriate, you know, table or formula that
6 the ITE model or ITE methodology presents.

7

In addition to that -- I mean, there is a
8 rate and then there's a formula and then there's
9 local information which because the ITE is a
10 standard like a national average, if you will, for
11 each of those 36 or 37 buildings and we have -- I
12 think the detailed information is available for
13 review -- a trip generation was conducted using the
14 most appropriate, you know -- most suitable table
15 and then it looked vertically at those numbers and
16 picked the highest, even if the highest was a bit
17 higher than what the local information would say.
18 And just for an instance, one of the sites from what
19 I recall was the meal barn which is -- its adaptive
20 use is to be some sort of a pub/restaurant.

21

The number that was used in the model was
22 that that meal barn will generate 85 trips in a week
23 and morning peak hour period and we struggled with
24 that one because we really don't believe there's
25 gonna be 85 additional trips from the outside --

1

2 outside of the area that's gonna come into this meal
3 barn for, you know, a brunch or a donut, but we
4 stated our assumptions at first before realizing
5 what the outcome would be and only would go back to
6 that assumption if our outcome came, you know,
7 resulted in some operational impact and it didn't,
8 so we kept that high number in there to try to help
9 support the approach we took.

10 We could have at that point said, no,
11 it's definitely not 85 and when we came up with that
12 we did check with the local information. We got
13 information from the park and we wanted to follow
14 through with that and only had to go back with it if
15 we needed to. So, we tried to pick not what is the
16 most representative trip that would be generated,
17 because I can't tell you that, we were looking to
18 test this proposed development from a traffic impact
19 point of view and try to pick that worst case to
20 make it fit that model that we got from the state
21 which was looking at the worst case. Did I answer
22 the question?

23 MR. RIKER: Fulsomely.

24 MS. JENSEN: Next question.

25 MR. RIKER: Absolutely, I agree with you,

1

2 I cannot believe that they would have 85 people
3 coming to a pub before lunch, but for all of that I
4 did see the six numbers that purported to be the
5 results of your study. You quoted one of them the
6 weekend arrival rate. Four of the numbers were
7 associated with the weekday, the a.m. arrivals and
8 the p.m. arrivals as well as the a.m. departures and
9 the p.m. departures.

10 Now, they are the sum total of all the
11 traffic generated by the new activity going into and
12 out of our fort on a weekday; is that correct?

13 MR. CORRADO: Weekday peak hour, just one
14 hour.

15 MR. RIKER: Just one hour in the
16 morning?

17 MR. CORRADO: And I'll pick the highest
18 number, you know. I don't want to say I'm trying to
19 hide it, but the weekday a.m. entering -- now, a.m.,
20 the public here can say -- what is the peak --
21 what's the hour, peak hour, seven to eight? 7:30 to
22 8:30? Does anybody know? I don't want to throw out
23 a number. Let's say -- is 7:30 to 8:30, okay?

24 AN AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why don't you know?
25 How come you don't know?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. CORRADO: Because it would -- it's irrelevant because I'm applying it to the highest. It's not -- it wasn't relevant to me in looking at the model as to when it occurred because in the model we're assuming that all of these 36 buildings that generate -- generated a total of 575 trips in that hour, we're saying that all occurred at the same time, that there are no internal captured trips. That each trip is a new trip, each trip is by car and each car has one person and it occurred at the same time that the traffic network is peaking. We looked at that because we didn't look at everything, we looked at what we felt was the worst of the worst of the worst --

MS. JENSEN: Okay. You have --

MR. CORRADO: -- to test it. That was the approach.

MS. JENSEN: You have your number, I think. Go on, you had another question.

MR. RYKER: Yes.

MR. CORRADO: Did I answer?

MR. RYKER: Yes, you did. I have another question or two, but I would ask in the interest of not hogging the time for the whole audience that you

1

2 give me yes or no on my remaining questions, if you
3 would.

4

5 They had an a.m. departure. Now, are you
6 saying that that's the peak hour a.m. departure for
7 this? It seems to be almost self-defeating. Is it
8 the same hour? Is the peak arrival hour the same as
9 the a.m. departure hour?

9

10 Excuse me, I argue I have not spoken for
11 two minutes. No way.

11

12 MS. JENSEN: All right. Well, let's get
13 this taken care of.

13

14 MR. CORRADO: Yes.

14

15 MR. RIKER: Thank you. I have couple of
16 questions -- thank you, sir. I have a couple
17 questions for Mr. Alexander. You provided an
18 analysis of the financial feasibility and the
19 economic assumptions in Sandy Hook Partners proposal
20 and tested their economic model for the
21 reasonableness of the development costs and rental
22 assumptions and ongoing management, maintenance and
23 management costs. Based on your analysis of this
24 material you have commended the selection of Sandy
25 Hook Partners. Do you think the public could arrive
at an informed opinion on whether the project's

1

2 benefits outweigh the negatives without any of this
3 information.

4

MR. ALEXANDER: I think that's a policy
5 decision for the park service to answer.

6

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Sure. I think we -- I'm
7 not sure what the public would use to measure the
8 pros and cons, but I think without all the data
9 which Bill Alexander might have used as part of the
10 models that he would use I think it would be very
11 difficult, yes, it would be very difficult.

12

MR. RYKER: Thank you. And my next
13 question is for you, sir. My next two questions.
14 If I understand your answer to my recent question
15 and your responses several times earlier today, you
16 have informed us that the public may not know who
17 all the participants with Mr. Wossel are, what the
18 financial arrangements will be, what the order of
19 magnitude of his investment would be or any of these
20 other factors because they are ongoing in the lease.

21

MR. ADLERSTEIN: No, you do know who
22 is -- you do know who the team is, it's all in
23 that -- it's in his document.

24

MR. RYKER: The new partners. We don't
25 know what -- excuse me, you had said that --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Who his partners will be, yes, who his partners will be. He doesn't -- I assume --

MR. RIKER: Okay. Let me --

MR. ADLERSTEIN: We don't know where the money's coming from, you're right. When we --

MR. RIKER: We don't know what the order of magnitude of their investment is, we don't know what the probability of success is, we do not know what the amount of traffic it is, we do not know what the phasing of the project is, we do not know its staging, we do not know the penalties if they do not achieve interim goals, we do not know any of the facts that lead to a rational understanding of the probability of success. That was my question.

MS. JENSEN: Your time is up. If there's a comment to that...

MR. ADLERSTEIN: That's fine. Let me address that question. What we are asking the public to do is not to invest your money into the Sandy Hook Partnership, that is the Sandy Hook Partnership's responsibility. We're asking for the concept of the reuse of the buildings on Fort Hancock.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me take 30 seconds to just add some context to this discussion. The Fort Hancock buildings which have been partially in use over the past 30 years and many of them under utilized are deteriorating and they are national landmark buildings. We are required by law to be the steward of national landmark buildings and we are required by law to find a solution whether congress invested the funds, and as you heard from the congressman it's very difficult. We have a four or four-and-a-half billion dollar backlog of work that needs to be funded in the National Park System, so whether -- even if this were raised to the highest priority, it would be very difficult for congress to fund it, but if they were to fund it we would still be facing this same dialogue as today.

These buildings, if they're put into use, and we do have the obligation to try to find a way to put them into use because they're national landmarks, if these buildings were put into use we would have traffic, we would have -- we would have use of these buildings which would have the same sewerage problems, which would have the same road problems, which would have a variety of problems.

1

2 What we're -- so, I think we two very separate
3 issues here. We have the issue of whether the
4 public wants the National Park Service to allow
5 these buildings to deteriorate and just leave them
6 as they are or whether the public wants the park
7 service to proceed and put these buildings back into
8 use.

9

 The second issue which is quite separate
10 from that is the funding source for getting them
11 back into use whether we should be proceeding with a
12 partnership with the private sector or whether we
13 should wait for congress, but the use that we have
14 chosen, office space we felt -- and we're willing --
15 and this is what the debate is sometimes about, we
16 felt would be the least impacting use for the
17 residents of this -- of the neighboring communities
18 because this use doesn't focus on the recreational
19 use when on summer weekends when Fort Hancock, when
20 Sandy Hook is very heavily congested.

21

 Office space use is -- happens all year
22 round on the weekdays generally and we assume that
23 most office workers will not want to come to Fort
24 Hancock on the summer Sundays when the traffic is so
25 difficult. So, we have selected this development

1

2 team partially for the concept that we are -- that
3 we do want to get our buildings, it's our obligation
4 to get our buildings back into use, they are
5 national landmarks and we're trying to do it in a
6 way that works with the community and I -- so I just
7 wanted to put that statement out there.

8

MS. JENSEN: Down at the end.

9

MR. ALEXANDER: I'd like to comment on
10 the financial feasibility. Although the specific
11 numbers have not been made available, I think you're
12 certainly entitled to know the methodology by which
13 we undertook the financial feasibility.

14 The first thing that I did in testing all
15 of the proposals was to put together, based upon the
16 previous experience in our company plus my previous
17 experience as a member of a loan committee, as a
18 board member of a regional banking system in eastern
19 Pennsylvania, we put together a model that we could
20 test what financial information we did have. The
21 Wossel proposal seemed to be the most credible
22 fitting into that particular model.

23 We then -- as the negotiations proceeded
24 with Mr. Wossel, we got a proforma operating
25 statement that he had prepared, we tested that

1

2 against the regional model that I had prepared. I
3 then reviewed it against the financial not the
4 proformas, but the actual operating histories of
5 projects that I had familiarity with.

6

 We then used the Robert Morris Associates
7 real estate data which the banking community uses
8 throughout the United States to measure financial
9 proformas against standards for lending and we found
10 that the proforma from Mr. Wossel did fall within
11 the guidelines of all those tests that we applied to
12 it.

13

 Now, real estate development is a risky
14 business. Markets change, technology changes,
15 demographics change and it's a due diligence process
16 and as I said before, I'm satisfied that the testing
17 of this financial model was done with a great deal
18 of diligence.

19

 MS. JENSEN: We have eight more people on
20 the list. I would ask that the speakers be concise
21 in their remarks and questions and the same with the
22 panelists and I will ask the panelists and the
23 audience if you are willing to stay a little bit if
24 it runs over.

25

 Okay. Following Sue Goldberg is Louisa

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

McMillan. Go ahead.

MS. GOLDBERG: I'm Sue Goldberg. I'm a resident of Highlands. I respect the information being provided by the panel and I'm hopeful that you are all addressing or will be addressing the concerns of many of the people in the audience. I appreciate the opportunity to just state my feelings.

It would be a grave mistake to turn this major parcel of ocean, beach and historic landmark into a multiuse of commercial enterprise. The State of New Jersey and the national government should be giving substantial tax incentives to individuals, groups and corporations who can underwrite the restoration of Fort Hancock and preserve it as museum space, a home for environmental organizations and for educational institutions. We do not need the pollution of water, land, air and noise probable with the creation of marinas, hotels, restaurants, theater or amusement parks. We do not need the traffic either. We may need the revenue, but we have to look beyond our immediate needs and save the future of this state and this coastline for the generations of humans and other animals who depend

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

on Sandy Hook for its beauty and its environmental importance. Thank you.

MS. JENSEN: Louisa McMillan will be followed by Joe McDonnell.

MS. McMILLAN: Hi. I just -- the gentleman that made the comment earlier about a resident, Highlands resident being on the front page of the paper, that was me and just for his information I'm a lifelong New Jersey resident and I pay almost \$8,000 a year in taxes in Highlands and I have every right -- I think that affords me the opportunity to have an opinion in the newspaper and if anyone has a problem with that, it's too bad.

As a lifelong resident in New Jersey I never once came to the beach in the winter for recreation or for hospitality purposes. I think that if the Wossel Corporation can or if Mr. Wossel can get a loan to do this, certainly the parks department can get a loan to put up museums, to put a scuba museum, historical fisherman's and clamming museum, art center, recreational activities and, you know, generate income by admission fees in addition to having gift shops which would also generate revenue and bring in profits in order to pay for the

1

2 restoration and I'm sure that the bank would
3 certainly, you know, see that the traffic that the
4 parks get -- that the park gets here in the
5 summertime is sufficient enough traffic to think
6 that they could reasonable repay the loan.

7

I live right under the Twin Lakes
8 Lighthouse and there is an easement, so the parks --
9 there is an easement on my property for the park
10 that's above me. So, the parks can impose
11 easements, the parks can have easements on their
12 property. And I, you know, I pay such a great deal
13 of tax money and, you know, you can't tell me that
14 all the traffic that's gonna be, you know, increased
15 by here is gonna impact our local roads and I'm
16 gonna have to pay more money in taxes to have the
17 roads repaved from the additional traffic and
18 pollution and whatever else that this -- that a
19 commercial enterprise could generate.

20

And furthermore, I think that if we --
21 you know, I don't think any of us really want to see
22 a corporate development on Yellow Stone, so for --
23 you know, why would we allow that here? I just
24 don't understand that and I don't think that the
25 price -- I think that, you know, obviously the

1
2 buildings need to be repaired. If you read the
3 newspaper article you know that I just renovated my
4 house, completely renovated my house, \$200,000 worth
5 of renovations, eight months and so I know that it
6 doesn't cost \$60 million to renovate these
7 buildings. And I can tell you that I don't really
8 understand why it's gonna cost this much money and
9 certainly I don't really think that -- you know, in
10 order to calculate how much money you're gonna need
11 to generate in order to pay these loans, did you,
12 you know, calculate your traffic assessment based on
13 how many cars and how much money per car you're
14 gonna need to bring in here in order to generate
15 that money to repay that loan?

16 So, there's a few things to think about.
17 I don't really -- I think that the traffic
18 assessment was a joke and I think that this hearing
19 should be asking the public what should we do with
20 the buildings, not voting on something that we just
21 don't even have any, you know, any insight on. And
22 the parks department I think really has either a
23 lack of will or a lack of effort in solving the
24 problem. This is a very easy out for them and --

25 MS. JENSEN: Time is up.

1

2

MS. McMILLAN: -- and I think that the public should make the decision. Thank you.

4

MS. JENSEN: Do you want to respond?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WILSON: Perhaps Betsy Barrett from the Sandy Hook Foundation may be say a few words about the experience that the Sandy Hook Foundation has had over in the past, well, few years and since 1989 in trying to pursue the restoration of some of the buildings out here.

MS. BARRETT: After the meeting I would be delighted to show this particular report, it's called "The Sandy Hook Lighthouse Keepers Quarters Report" by Hulk Morgan Russell from Princeton, a well-known restoration architect firm.

We were given the charge at Sandy Hook Foundation to help restore the lighthouse keeper's quarters which, as you know, is attached to the oldest continuously working lighthouse in the country and so we need to do this very carefully, very professionally and as it turns out, very expensively. We took on the charge not -- knowing very little about it about two years ago and it's now been a learning process that I'd be glad to share with you after the meeting, but the long and

1

2 short of it right here is one book that will give
3 you what took about eight months from this very
4 comprehensive study by this firm and about \$33,000
5 which was also a discount to show us specifically
6 what was the fabric within the lighthouse keeper's
7 quarters that we need to retain, restore,
8 rehabilitate to make sure that it's available for
9 the public to use.

10 The second part of this is we call this
11 lighthouse keeper's quarters and it's used by -- it
12 will eventually be used by office space for the
13 Sandy Hook Foundation as well as the New Jersey
14 Lighthouse Association and their volunteers to give
15 tours strictly on weekends. And as many of you
16 probably know, you'd like to get up in the
17 lighthouse much more frequently than you can at the
18 moment which is simply Saturday and Sunday
19 afternoons.

20 So, the volunteers from the New Jersey
21 Lighthouse Association come and stay there and they
22 sleep on blowup mattresses or sleeping bags on
23 floors that date back to about 1920. It's not very
24 attractive. We also hope to do educational programs
25 there, it will be open to the public and so forth

1

2 and so on. So, when we use it for those multiple
3 uses it's now deemed, quote, commercial.

4

Many of you are throwing around the word
5 commercial. I don't want to see things
6 commercialized. Here you go with a commercialized
7 usage because by code it becomes commercial so we
8 need to fire proof it, we need to make sure that
9 it's got all kinds of code specifications dictated
10 by the state and these particular costs, and if any
11 of you have seen this little tiny cottage, will
12 probably exceed \$600,000.

13

Now, as the last speaker just said, why
14 not get volunteers in there? You cannot by law, by
15 code, by restoration, by preservation, you cannot do
16 it this way. There are absolute dictates that we
17 must follow and thankfully that's true, so that
18 people like me who have very little restoration
19 knowledge are not sent in there with a hammer and a
20 nail. This has got to be done by professionals who
21 are certified and the fact is it takes a great deal
22 of time, a great deal of money and an enormous
23 amount of talent from outside people and we need to
24 do it carefully and very specifically and we are a
25 clear indication of what Mr. Wossel's group and

1

2 everybody else will have to face when they get out
3 here. We've had direct experience.

4

MR. WILSON: And I would just add that
5 each structure out here is a national and historic
6 landmark structure and each structure requires that
7 we go through the same rigorous process and even
8 when the National Park Service renovated a mess hall
9 as our headquarters we did it with a skilled
10 National Park Service architect doing the drawings,
11 skilled National Park Service craftsman doing the
12 work and it was after the state historic
13 preservation office approved the plans that we put
14 forward about how we would go about that.

15

MS. JENSEN: Is Joe McDonnell here? Then
16 next is Louise Yuschek followed by Peter Brovman.

17

MR. YUSCHEK: Yes, I want to -- really
18 first and foremost I really do want to thank you all
19 for holding this hearing with an open format and
20 that it's being conducted as it is being conducted
21 this afternoon.

22

I've been reading about this, I've gone
23 to eastern branch library, I've read the materials
24 that were there and I have a few concerns and
25 questions that I just wanted to share with you.

1

2 First of all, I found that the materials that were
3 to be made available to the public have been sort of
4 hard to get in a timely way and in particular the
5 RFP and the lease agreement, but that was just for
6 me coming later on the scene here, and to their
7 credit the park system was very helpful in getting
8 the material out to the library this Wednesday when
9 I couldn't find it.

10 MR. WILSON: Can we say for the record
11 that the superintendent returned your call?

12 MS. YUSCHEK: Oh, absolutely, yes,
13 indeed, that's true.

14 In any event, I have as a result of this,
15 however, some concerns about the public process, you
16 know, to date and therefore for the future and I
17 would like to see if it's possible that there be
18 some sort of, I don't know, public advisory
19 committee or some sort of structured oversight group
20 of independent organizations which represent public
21 interest. That something like that be established
22 here as we go forward in this process, not just now,
23 but also as we go through the different phases of
24 it.

25 I'm also concerned about how you will be

1
2 guaranteeing adequate protection of the public
3 interest in the future in decisions that may be made
4 regarding Fort Hancock as opposed to furthering the
5 interest and goals of the private enterprises or
6 enterprise being considered for a lease should these
7 actually ever come into conflict. At some point in
8 the future it could be that the park system could
9 come to perceive the private development success as
10 critical to the National Park Service interest in
11 terms of generating revenues for additional projects
12 that the park system may have and I'd just like to
13 be assured that the interest of the greater public
14 will be given the same consideration.

15 And I did intend to begin this by saying
16 that I've lived in Monmouth County all my life and
17 Sandy Hook has been a dear love as well. I think we
18 all want to see Fort Hancock preserved and I think
19 that there's some very real challenges that are
20 being addressed by everyone on both sides as we try
21 to find a way in which that can be done and that
22 also there be a public perception that everything
23 has been addressed.

24 I really have to say after being on the
25 Shrewsbury Environmental Commission for ten years

1

2 that I would have been a lot more reassured if an
3 environmental impact statement had been done or
4 study, but now I understand and I do hope, however,
5 that one will be done as you go forward. As much as
6 I want to see the buildings restored I also feel
7 that preserving the integrity of the land protecting
8 the rights of the public is something that has to be
9 guaranteed.

10 And a little bit I'm concerned as well
11 about water, your sewerage issues, the
12 infrastructure and so forth. I have to say I was a
13 little disturbed by an earlier conversation today
14 about who the partners are because I note in the
15 request for proposals that it also indicates that
16 financial statements for two previous fiscal years
17 should also be submitted and it sounds as if this
18 organization may not have actually been in this
19 particular form, you know, that --

20 MS. JENSEN: Your time is up.

21 MS. YUSCHEK: Okay. Thank you. My last
22 parting comment is I really would like to see some
23 priority given so that the marine sciences and Noah
24 and MASC could be allowed to expand in the future if
25 that becomes necessary. Thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ADLERSTEIN: Let me just make one comment about this advisory body which some people have suggested it and the previous speaker did. We are prohibited by law from having citizen groups be technically advisory to the federal government and that's -- there's advisory commissions that are set up and each one has a separate piece of legislation, but what I would encourage is that we do have a very fine partner sitting next to the end of the table here that our partnership here at Sandy Hook and members of the public that would like to join our foundation then should please join so. We can -- we will share and we continue to share significant issues with the foundation on a continual basis.

Let me also make a comment about the whole issue of business in the national parks. Some of the previous speakers have suggested that at some of the western parks, Yellow Stone, Yosemite has been quoted, you know, that they wouldn't be doing things like this and I have to tell you that the largest business in the national park system are our fine concessionaire partners in our western parks. Yellow Stone, Grand Canyon, Glazier, Teatons, they all significant private partners in business with

1

2 them and when there's a change in the way that needs
3 to be -- that business needs to be conducted it's
4 done with the public. There's nothing that's
5 inherently bad about the National Park System
6 partnering with the private sector and we've done it
7 for -- we've done it for decades.

8

MS. JENSEN: Peter Brovman.

9

MR. BROVMAN: Hi. I'm Peter Brovman. I
10 live in Neptune, Monmouth County and I just want to
11 comment that I find it odd that you go to this
12 commercial development when maybe five or six years
13 ago you objected to the craft show that Clearwater
14 had in August because of the commercial aspects. I
15 see a contradiction there.

16

 The other -- another question I have is
17 why when the request for proposal specified a lease
18 of 15 to 20 years it's been changed to 60 years for
19 the present discussion. Is there justification for
20 that? When the other bidders weren't even aware, I
21 presume, weren't aware that that was the proposed
22 time for the lease.

23

MS. JENSEN: I think we have two
24 questions here.

25

MR. WILSON: Taking your first question

1
2 first, about five to seven years ago, time flies,
3 the National Park Service changed it's regulations
4 on a national level to prohibit the sale of crafts,
5 T-shirts and things of that nature with parks and
6 that action was taken because parks were just being
7 overrun by requests for people to sell craft --
8 primarily T-shirts in park areas under the guise of
9 1st Amendment activities and the only way to check
10 those sales was to just prohibit those types of
11 sales across the board on a national level. And I
12 would hope you would take some comfort in it that
13 well not -- this development is not about coming in
14 and having rubber Tomahawks and T-shirts hanging
15 from the front porches of Officers Row, this is a
16 very tasteful way of dealing with the rehabilitation
17 of these buildings --

18 (End of Tape No. 2, Side B.)

19 MR. WILSON: -- for people who wanted to
20 come in and rehabilitate qualified historic
21 structures and it's a 20 percent return on the
22 investment, but congress didn't want people to take
23 advantage of that tax credit without assurances that
24 the building would not only be renovated, but that
25 the building would be cared for over a long period

1

2 of time and so the way that tax credit is
3 structured, it pretty much requires a 40-year lease
4 before you become eligible and us taking into
5 consideration the large investment that would
6 require to come in into Fort Hancock and running the
7 economic models that were run, a 60-year lease was
8 appropriate for that investment.

9

MR. BROVMAN: And why was the Sandy Hook
10 birds Observatory limited to 20 years.

11

MR. WILSON: Sandy Hook -- the New Jersey
12 Audubon Society did not make an approval for a
13 historic lease. We were able to handle them under a
14 cooperative agreement. Cooperative agreements are
15 limited to 20 years in length and we also wanted --
16 and generally they're five years in length, but we
17 recognized that they invested close to \$300,000 in
18 the Sandy Hook Bird Observatory, so we were able to
19 offer them the maximum length of time that we do
20 under a cooperative agreement.

21

MR. BROVMAN: Oh, okay. And one other
22 point I wanted to make. I noticed in the
23 proposal -- I mean, in your -- well, somewhere in
24 the paperwork it's proposed to use soil furnaces or
25 oil fueled plants to heat -- to provide the heat.

1

2 Wouldn't it be better to have a natural gas line put
3 in by New Jersey Natural Gas.

4

 MR. WILSON: Yes, we think it might be
5 and we are exploring that in an environmental
6 assessment that we're working on which would bring a
7 natural gas pipeline in as part of the multi use
8 path. The bike trail we're proposing to construct
9 which it has -- where the bike trail has been funded
10 by congress and it would lead to, you know, cleaner
11 burning fuel available on Sandy Hook, it leads to
12 some other exciting things like the chance for us to
13 use micro turban technology to generate our own
14 electricity locally rather than, you know, having
15 the big demand and getting the lines taken down. I
16 mean, it's a -- we agree with you, sir.

17

 MR. BROVMAN: Well, I hope you get it
18 then.

19

 MR. WILSON: Thank you.

20

 MR. BROVMAN: Thanks very much for the
21 opportunity.

22

 MS. JENSEN: Maria Grace Brovman followed
23 by Tom Daily.

24

 MRS. BROVMAN: Thank you very much. I
25 live in the same town, Neptune Township with my

1

2 husband. What puzzles me is I don't know how -- I
3 think there are too many unknowns of the traffic
4 situation. I can't imagine how we can increase the
5 use of the park by people and cars and the
6 commercialism and not have --

7

MR. WILSON: Excuse me one second. Can
8 we -- ma'am, can you pull the microphone closer to
9 your mouth? We're really having a hard time hearing
10 you.

11

MRS. BROVMAN: Can you hear me now?

12

MR. WILSON: That's much better, thank
13 you.

14

MRS. BROVMAN: Okay. I don't see how you
15 can -- everything's been pretty much hashed over,
16 however, I don't know see how you can increase the
17 capacity of this place, cars, people commercialism
18 and everything else that's being planned. There are
19 too many unknowns in the statistics and you can't
20 possibly increase that much without having an impact
21 on the ecology and everything else.

22

And also what worries me in particular at
23 this point is even not all these things which may
24 destroy the area as we know it, you speak of a new
25 Fort Monmouth. We don't need a new Fort Monmouth,

1

2 we need repairs, but do you realize how close we are
3 to the military base out in the -- across the river
4 here? Are there any plans for security for all
5 these people coming in commercially we don't know?
6 Have any plans been set up for any kind of security
7 or check, have there? Can you answer me?

8

MR. WILSON: We're acutely aware of how
9 close we are to our own Earle Naval Weapon Station
10 and it's something our staff has been working on
11 every since September 11th.

12

MRS. BROVMAN: And gonna have people
13 coming in from all over and the traffic patterns we
14 plan are fine for getting to the place, but this
15 place is really a bottleneck. Once you get here you
16 have a hard time getting in. Who's gonna keep
17 control on who comes in and how?

18

MR. WILSON: Let me answer your security
19 concerns in a little more detail. You know, when
20 we're open for business during the summer anybody
21 with \$10 gets in here and it's up to us to patrol
22 the area internally to control security. The
23 development -- on the other hand, let me contrast
24 that with the development where we're being provided
25 by -- the lease provides that we -- we are provided

1
2 by rent roles and in order for us to issue a pass to
3 the people who will be coming out here and parking
4 as part of the leasing effort we'll have their
5 license, you know, number, their plate number
6 recorded in the things -- the information that we
7 take down when we issue a pass, a permanent parking
8 pass. So, they'll be an incredible amount of
9 control over the development as opposed to our
10 general use. I mean, and as I said \$10, that's
11 during the summer. During, you know, the nine and a
12 half months out of the year we're open you can, you
13 know, just drive in and drive out, there's no check
14 at all.

15 MRS. BROVMAN: Is there any data on --
16 when this place is running at capacity at the peak
17 of its -- whatever it can absorb, what happens
18 then? If we're just overrun? Now, you say bigger
19 places have done this, that and that. We're not
20 that big that we can absorb all this.

21 MR. WILSON: And we're not -- one of the
22 things the plan did was not to increase parking, it
23 was just to reallocate parking, shift parking spaces
24 around to accommodate a change in parking. We're
25 not trying to attract more traffic. In fact, we're

1

2 looking to provide alternative means of access that
3 do not rely on automobiles such as the bike trail
4 which I mentioned earlier and a ferry dock.

5 MRS. BROVMAN: Oh, I wanted to ask also
6 before I leave, has this group contacted the Navy or
7 do we work together with them on anything.

8 MR. WILSON: We're in close contact, of
9 course, with the coast guard who also, you know,
10 lives and works here at Sandy Hook alongside of us
11 and my ranger staff coordinates closer with naval
12 investigative service who's in charge of security
13 for their own Earle Naval Weapons Station.

14 MRS. BROVMAN: Thank you.

15 MS. JENSEN: Is Tom Daily here? Adele
16 Keller, the last name on the list.

17 MS. KELLER: Thank you. I'll be brief.
18 I just want to say that I am -- my name is Adele
19 Keller. I'm from Monmouth Conservation Foundation.
20 I'm also lifelong resident of the county.

21 I just want to reiterate some things that
22 were already said and call for the need to have more
23 information, especially about the Sandy Hook
24 Partners plan. I think we also need to have an
25 impact study done. One of the things, though, that

1
2 really concerns me is that when I read about Fort
3 Baker and it seems when you look at that up front it
4 seems very similar to Fort Hancock, that there were
5 a lot of differences in the process. Right from the
6 beginning there was a request for qualifications,
7 rather than a request for proposals, there was an
8 environmental impact study done and there was an
9 advisory committee. Could you explain why there is
10 such a difference in the two processes?

11 MR. WILSON: I can't speak
12 comprehensively for Baker, but I will say the reason
13 you do an environmental impact study is because
14 you've identified a significant impact that needs to
15 be studied and the process that we're in right now,
16 the environmental assessment process is to see if
17 there, indeed, is a nonmitigatable significant
18 impact that then puts us into the study period.

19 MS. KELLER: So, then, in Fort Baker what
20 they did was the environmental assessment first and
21 then they found the need to go further and do the
22 impact study?

23 MR. ADLERSTEIN: I think -- and I wasn't
24 involved with the decision-making at Fort Baker and
25 I'm not sure exactly how they -- whether they went

1
2 through environmental assessments first, but the
3 situation is different in that at Fort Baker you
4 have an abandoned military base that's been
5 basically almost no use for the previous 25 years
6 and the attempt by the park service was to bring
7 that base back to -- was to bring those facilities
8 back to use unlike at Fort Hancock where we have --
9 where we are in the midst of a very active facility
10 where we have eight or 9,000 people coming on
11 weekend days to this park and that we're doing --
12 and we're doing a function within there. So,
13 they're not exactly parallel situations, but I'm not
14 sure at Fort Baker whether they did an environmental
15 assessment first.

16 MS. KELLER: And what about the request
17 for qualifications up front rather than a request
18 for proposals? Because that seems like a really
19 important thing.

20 MR. ADLERSTEIN: We've done this either
21 way. The request for qualifications was done at
22 Fort Baker in order to develop a short list of who
23 would be invited to submit proposals in response to
24 the RFP. Their sense was that if they went out with
25 an RFP that they would have an overwhelming number

1

2 of responses and they did not want to -- and they
3 had the hotel industry because they had responses
4 from Marriott and Hilton and a lot of very large
5 players. We did not feel that they were in the same
6 situation here at Fort Hancock and therefore, we
7 decided to not do it that -- we did not feel like we
8 needed to restrict who could submit a proposal.

9

They did the initial step, brought it
10 down to four teams that were being -- and the only
11 people who were allowed to respond to the RFP were
12 the four teams that responded -- that went through
13 the first filter.

14

MS. KELLER: And last, but not least, why
15 was there an advisory committee established there
16 early on?

17

MR. ADLERSTEIN: I'm not familiar with
18 whether there was an advisory -- I mean, I'm not
19 a --

20

MS. KELLER: There is, yeah.

21

MR. ADLERSTEIN: -- of non park service
22 people?

23

MS. KELLER: Yeah, I believe it's a
24 16-member committee and eight -- I think eight are
25 from the Town of Sothaleddo and I think eight were

1

2 -- you know, I think the National Park Service was
3 allowed to name eight people.

4 MR. ADLERSTEIN: I'm not --

5 MS. KELLER: I just think -- well, that
6 is a very interesting project and I encourage anyone
7 who can get on-line to take a look at that because
8 the information on-line is very interesting. Thank
9 you.

10 MS. JENSEN: Thank you. That concludes
11 this public meeting. I want to thank all of you for
12 coming and for staying through to the bitter end so
13 that you can hear all aspects of these proposals and
14 I thank the panel for staying as well.

15 MR. WILSON: Thank you all.

16 (End of Tape No. 3, Side A.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE

I, LYDIA FUCCI-McDONNELL, a Notary Public
and C.S.R. of the State of New Jersey, License No.
X101559, do hereby certify that the following is a
true and accurate transcript of the proceedings as
transcribed by and before me at the time, place and
on the date hereinbefore set forth.

Notary Public of the State of New Jersey

My Commission expires April 2004.

Dated: June 24, 2002

